THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

HENRY TOWNSEND D.D.

Class 234.1R Book T664
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

BY

HENRY TOWNSEND

M.A., D.D.

THESIS APPROVED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY NEW YORK

METHUEN & CO. LTD.

36 ESSEX STREET W.C.

LONDON

234.1R
T664

65899

First Published in 1919

22 '19

UNION THEOL. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

TO

MY MOTHER

AND

MY WIFE

PREFACE

I DESIRE to express my thanks to my tutor, the Rev. J. T. Marshall, M.A., D.D., Principal of the Baptist College, Manchester, and the Rev. J. B. Turner, of Rossendale, who read parts of this book in manuscript, and to whom I am indebted for help. In preparing the book for the press, my dear friend, the Rev. J. C. Keyte, M.A., of China, who is in England on furlough, has read the whole in proof and made valuable suggestions. For his help I am exceedingly grateful.

HUDDERSFIELD, *January*, 1919.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

		PAGE
I.	Limitation of Scope to Synoptic gospels	1
II.	Grace in the Old Testament	8
	A. *Hen* and *Ḥesedh*	8
	B. Doctrine of Grace in Deutero-Isaiah	14
	C. Doctrine of Grace in the Priestly Code	21
III.	Grace in Jewish Literature	25
	A. Grace and Legalistic Pharisaism	26
	B. Grace and Jewish Apocalyptic	33

BOOK ONE

The Grace of God Objective and Subjective in the Personality of Jesus

CHAPTER I

The Grace of God prompting His Action in Jesus

A.	The Birth Narratives	43
	1. Critical Results	43
	2. The Birth Account in Luke	44
	3. The Birth Account in Matthew	47
	4. The Birth a Revelation of Divine Grace	48
B.	The Baptism	50
C.	The Temptation	53
D.	The Sermon at Nazareth	57
E.	The Father's Unique Committal	59
F.	Our Lord's Authority	61
	1. To Forgive Sins	61
	2. Over the Sabbath	65
	3. Over the Temple	66
	4. The Great Commission	67
G.	Our Lord at Prayer	68
H.	Our Lord's Inspired Activity	71

PAGE

I. Our Lord's Death 72
1. Its Necessity 72
2. The Ransom Passage 79
3. Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen . . . 82
4. The Lord's Supper 84
a. Critical Questions 84
b. The New Covenant 86
c. Sacramental Grace 94
J. The Resurrection 98

CHAPTER II

The Quest, the Appeal, the Welcome of God's Grace in Jesus

A. The Quest of Grace 101
1. The Preacher of Grace 101
2. The Quest for Sinners 102
3. The Parables of the Lost Sheep and Coin . . 103
4. Zacchæus 106
B. The Appeal of Grace 107
1. The Invitation of Grace 107
2. Parables of the Great Supper and Marriage of the King's Son 109
C. The Welcome of Grace 111
1. Parable of the Gracious Father 111
2. The Pharisee and the Publican 114
3. The Dying Malefactor 114
D. Summary 116

CHAPTER III

Grace and the Miracles

A. Grace and History 118
B. Grace and Metaphysics 120
C. The Universe of Miraculous Experience . . . 122
D. Miracles as Part of Our Lord's Ethic 124
E. Synoptic Evidence 127
1. Privative Cases 127
2. Cases of Bodily Disease 127
3. Cases of Paralysis 129

PAGE
4. Cases of Exorcism 130
5. Raising the Dead 131
6. Nature Miracles 132
7. Summaries 133

CHAPTER IV

Grace and Synoptic Eschatology

I. Preliminary Considerations 134
II. Synoptic Apocalyptic Teaching 136
a. Christian 136
b. Jewish-Christian 139
III. Final Grace 143

BOOK TWO

The Grace of God Objective in Jesus and Subjective in Human Experience

CHAPTER I

Psychological Effect of God's Grace in Men, Produced by Jesus

A. Experimental Effects 151
1. Jesus Evokes Faith 151
2. The Call and Mission of the Disciples . . . 154
3. The Consciousness of Holy Spirit 155
4. Revelation through Subjective Experience . . 159
5. Summary 164
B. Christ's Interpretation of Experience Evoked by Himself . 166
1. The Parable of the Sower 166
2. The Growing Seed, Mustard Seed, Leaven . . 168
3. The Mystery of the Kingdom 169
4. That which is Given 171
5. Parables of the Pounds and Talents . . . 172
6. The Hidden Treasure and the Pearl 174

CHAPTER II

Grace and Motive

A. The Sinner in the City 176
B. Divine Grace and Human Forgiveness 179

CHAPTER III

Grace and Our Lord's Teaching on Prayer

PAGE

A. Prayer and Inspired Motive 185
B. Prayer as a Means of Grace 186
C. The Place of Jesus in His Teaching on Prayer . . . 190
D. Evolution and Christian Prayer 192

CHAPTER IV

Grace and the Sermon on the Mount

A. The Beatitudes 199
B. Discipleship as Salt and Light 205
C. The Ethic which Exceeds 205
D. The Absolute Principle of Love 207

CHAPTER V

The Subjective Experience of Grace Which is Life

A. Moral Activity and Incorruption 213
B. The Narrow Gate and Way 214
C. Permanence of Character Built on Christ . . . 215
D. Social Ethics and Destiny 216
E. The Ethic of Vigilance 217
F. Death and Life 218

CHAPTER VI

Grace and the Christian Ethic

A. Grace and Dying to Live 221
1. Life through Death 221
2. Drinking the Lord's Cup 222
3. The Inspiration to Finish Life's Task . . . 223
B. Grace and the New Legalism 225

Index 237

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

DOCTRINE OF GRACE IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

INTRODUCTION

I

LIMITATION OF SCOPE TO THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

SOME explanation is necessary concerning the limitation of this study in Grace to the Synoptic gospels. The main reason lies in the scope of Grace itself—a vast unfathomable sea. It is impossible to deal adequately with such a theme as Grace in any period, unless the whole field of religious experience during that period is brought under review. Our treatment of Grace cannot be measured by the presence or absence of a term like *charis*, which is not found in the first two gospels, and only four times in the Hebraic sense in Luke. The absence of *charis* from the synoptic documents is remarkable, especially when we recall its pregnant meaning for the Apostle Paul. Its omission, however, is an important, if indirect, witness to the truth of the synoptic portrait of Jesus, and the experience which He is said to have evoked in others. The synoptists write of Jesus as the Bearer of divine Grace to men ; and this Grace is manifested in and through His Personal experience, His words and His works. They also describe certain effects of the Grace of Jesus on others. This means that any treatment of Grace, in order to be satisfactory, involves the investiga-

tion of the whole realm of experience as recorded by the synoptists. It will be recognized how wide the scope of such an inquiry is, even when it is confined to the Synoptic gospels This is the main reason for the limitation of the present study.

Then Modern Criticism recognizes the principle of development within the New Testament itself. We speak of the Synoptic, the Pauline, and the Johannine traditions. Hence, the limitation of scope in the present work is not arbitrary.

Again, when modern discussions as to the source and direction of the above-named development are considered, the time is opportune for an inquiry into the Doctrine of Grace in the Synoptic gospels. The issue, stated boldly by some, is, are we to trace New Testament Christianity to the historic Jesus or to Paul? Did Jesus, during His ministry, originate experience out of which New Testament theology evolved, or, did religious experience, the resultant of eclectic influences, create the Jesus-Idea? Another issue raises the nature of the Person and authority of Jesus; while another concerns itself with the place of Jesus in the general development of the world religions. A vast amount of literature has been written in recent years on the above questions; and it is surprising, how in men who belong to different schools of criticism, and write against each other, the lines cross and recross at certain points.

There are modern writers who deny that Jesus lived. They ought not to be ignored; they need to be answered.[1] These writers, however, are not likely to win so many adherents as those whom Loofs calls the liberal Jesus-picture critics. The latter class includes some great names, such as Wellhausen, Harnack, Jülicher and Bousset. They hold that Jesus can be explained within the limits of the purely human. Sanday writes with the utmost appreciation of Bousset; he even hesitates to take him literally at his word, and would all but persuade us that Bousset exalts Jesus above the

[1] See article by H. T. Andrews, *Expositor*, March, 1915.

merely human sphere.[1] On such a subject, however, Bousset would surely and seriously weigh his words, and he says that Jesus " never overstepped the limits of the purely human." [2] Then, as Loisy pointed out in *The Gospel and the Church*, Harnack finds the essence of the Christian religion in faith in a merciful Father, and holds that faith in the Son is no part of the synoptic evidence. With such critics the crux comes on the question of forgiveness. Had Jesus the authority of God to forgive sins on the earth ? The liberal view denies that He had such authority, and in doing so denies the unique objective character of the Grace of God in Jesus, a conclusion which has the utmost consequences for Christian Ethics.

Other recent writers have found the one key to the synoptic records in their eschatological teaching. J. Weiss and Schweitzer differ considerably from the aforementioned critics. They hold that Jesus taught the Kingdom of God to be altogether future ; that He believed Himself to be the Messiah who was to come on the clouds in great glory and inaugurate the kingdom. Jesus is said to have accepted Jewish apocalyptic hopes as He found them, and to have taught that such hopes were to be fulfilled at His Parousia. In this matter, events shewed that Jesus was deluded, and that He had deluded His followers. Schweitzer expresses this conclusion by saying that the purpose of Jesus had led Him into a blind alley ; for He died on the cross despairing of bringing in the new heaven and the new earth. Still, the tragedy of His end had a " liberating and life-giving influence, like every great tragedy." [3] This is as serious in its way as anything that Bousset said. It shews how the ' one key ' to the synoptic sources locks the door on the Doctrine of the Free Grace of God in Jesus. Nor does Schweitzer atone for this failure in his closing passage, where he refers to Christ in the most mystical terms as " one unknown and without name." But we cannot make the life of Jesus on the earth end in a cul-de-sac, and bring Him back as a reality for faith in this way.

[1] *Recent Research*, 193. [2] *Jesus*, 202 f.
[3] *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 254.

Lake, in his recent book,[1] has reasoned to the same conclusion, namely that our Lord's eschatological hope was an illusion. He maintains that Jesus fitted His full message into the apocalyptic categories of His age.[2] Lake is quite explicit concerning the outcome of his views: we cannot "find our Saviour," he says, "in one who conditioned his teaching by Jewish apocalypticism, and believed in what was, after all, an illusory expectation of the coming of the Kingdom of God."[3] The presuppositions of these thoroughgoing eschatologists have led us to a fuller investigation of the Doctrine of Grace in Jewish apocalyptic literature than might otherwise have seemed desirable.

Much has been written lately on the eclectic influences which are said to have shaped the presentation of Jesus in the Synoptic gospels, and of New Testament Christianity as a whole. In this way it has been attempted to state the true place of Christianity in the Evolution of Religion. On the one hand, the problem is discussed by E. Caird, with all his characteristic dignity and winsomeness of argument, forming the climax of his two volumes on the *Evolution of Religion*. On the other hand, the gospels are handled more roughly by Pfleiderer and Loisy. Schweitzer says the Greek genius, working through the eschatological teaching of Jesus, produced at length "the mystic, sensuous, early Christian doctrine of immortality, and consecrated Christianity as the religion of immortality, to take the place of the slowly dying civilizations of the ancient world."[4] Pfleiderer thinks the crowning point was reached, when Paul connected the Lord's Supper with baptism, and first gave to it the meaning of a sacramental act of worship. Paul regarded the Lord's Supper as partly a service in remembrance of Christ; partly, "a mystical community of the blood and body of Christ, mediated by the drinking of the sacramental cup and eating of the sacramental bread, whereby the participants achieve and strengthen alliance with their Master and with one

[1] *The Stewardship of Faith.* [2] p. 25. [3] p. 44.
[4] *Ibid.* 254.

another, just as the heathen enter into community with their demons by their sacrificial meal.[1] "

The whither of these views cannot be stated better than in Loisy's own words. "Jesus," he says, "was a saviour-god, after the manner of an Osiris, an Attis, a Mithra. Like them, he belonged by his origin to the celestial world ; like them he had to make his appearance on the earth ; like them he had accomplished a universal work of redemption, efficacious and typical ; like Adonis, Osiris, and Attis, he had died a violent death, and like them he had been restored to life . . . like them he had predestined, prepared, and assured the salvation of those who became partners in his passion." [2] A syncretism such as this makes it clear that for Christians "to sit lightly to the Christian facts is simple suicide."[3]

The liberal Jesus-picture critics, the apocalyptic school of critics, and the Modernists differ widely in their views of the portrait of Jesus in the Synoptic gospels ; they agree, however, that Jesus can no longer be regarded as the unique Personality who embodied the Father's Grace to men.

In view of the literature, mentioned above, which directly bears on the synoptic sources, or indirectly affects them, we limit our enquiry to the same sources. Our aim, however, is positive, and is not to answer criticism. We write because we do not think that the Doctrine of Grace has received the attention that its place in the Synoptic gospels demands. The writer does not know a systematic treatment of Grace in relation to the sources of the historic ministry. He is well aware of the old battle-cries. But the whole argument of the present work is that there was a Doctrine of Christian Grace before Paul ; that the experimental character of Grace in the Synoptic gospels can be brought out without discussing the problems raised by Augustine's philosophical presuppositions as the great Latin Father settled down to work on Pauline Anthropology.

[1] *Christian Origins*, 181. [2] *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1911.
[3] H. T. Andrews, *ibid.*, 197.

The method of study followed is that of dealing with Grace in its objective and subjective aspects. This method is often difficult, because the objective and subjective aspects of experience are never known except in relation to each other ; the difficulty is most obvious in any attempt to interpret the experience of Jesus and its value for others.

There are four facts to keep consistently before the mind. First, the Grace of the Father was objective to Jesus. Our Lord was conscious of His Father's gracious will or motive as having objective reality for Himself. Secondly, this objective Grace must be seen in relation to our Lord's subjective experience : it is necessary to do full justice to the thought, emotion and will of Jesus ; that is, our Lord's faith must be distinguished from its own objective. In the sections of this work, which deal with His Personal experience, the subjective character of the Father's Grace is seen in His strenuous and effective efforts of will. We see His will, often by fearful expenditure of moral effort, responding to the demands of the Father's Grace upon Him. Thirdly, both aspects of our Lord's experience are the supreme manifestation of divine Grace to men. He objectified or incarnated in His Person the Father's Grace to the world, at the same time, presenting through His Personal experience the ideal Christian Ethic. Fourthly, the fulness of God's Grace in Jesus has the utmost consequences for all men whether they accept Him or reject Him. Especially potent is His Grace for the ethical progress of His followers. At first, it was thought that Objective Grace might be treated in Book I, and Subjective Grace in Book II, but this was found too difficult in view of the subjective experience of Jesus referred to above. So that Book I deals with the first two aspects of Grace which have been mentioned. This leaves the subjective aspect of Grace in human experience as initiated and sustained by Jesus to be dealt with in Book II.

In the Christian life the relation of Grace to Ethics is most vital. An understanding of such relation is necessary to correct a false and shallow evangelicalism on the one hand,

and the new legalism on the other. The weakness of modern evangelicalism since the eighteenth century has been on its ethical side. The deplorable impotence of the new legalism is on the evangelical side. It accepts the Christian standard of conduct, often ignoring completely, at other times but dimly discerning, the nature of that inspiration to obedience which has its source in the experience of regenerating Grace.

Obviously the objective side of Grace predominates in the Synoptic gospels. In the Epistles the subjective side is more explicit. Paul's teaching on the psychological effect of divine Grace in the heart comes out in Phil. ii. 12: "Work out (or realize in conduct) your own salvation (already immanent in the justified and regenerate soul through the exercise of faith), with fear and trembling (godly awe for the Divine immanent Grace), for it is God that worketh in you (by inspiring initiative) to *will* and to work for His good pleasure." This aspect of Grace, in the light of Christian experience in the Apostolic age, is taken up into the Johannine rewriting of the gospel story; it is particularly set forth in the terms of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Jesus promised that the Spirit should guide the disciples into all the truth; that is, the Spirit was to inspire the highest discoveries of which we are assured in conscience, and obedience to His own promptings.[1] In the parable of the Vine, union with Christ is the presupposition of Christian Ethics: "He that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit: for apart from Me ye can do nothing." One of the common conclusions of the three schools of critics aforementioned, is to deny the presence of this subjective aspect of Grace in the synoptic writings. Apart from the views of such critics, however, the time is opportune for an investigation into the data of the synoptists for the purpose of bringing out their teaching on the subjective side of Grace. It may be there implicitly and under other forms than in the Pauline and Johannine writings.

[1] John chaps. 14–16.

II

GRACE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

A. Ḥen and Ḥesedh

BEFORE proceeding to examine the synoptic sources it is necessary to sketch briefly the hinterland, where streams of Grace arise and flow into New Testament territory. There were doctrines of Grace before Christ. Paul contrasted the Law and Grace as the distinctive features of the Old and the New Dispensations. But the Law as Paul knew it belonged to the period of religious decline among the Jews. Familiar with the Doctrine of Merit as taught in the Rabbis' schools, he soon recognized its antithesis in the Christian Doctrine of Grace. Paul's polemic, however, was directed against Jews steeped in the same Rabbinism as he himself once was, and his contrast between Law and Grace ought not to be pushed into regions beyond the realm in which he is reasoning. The author of the prologue of the Fourth gospel makes the same contrast: "the Law was given by Moses; Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." But Grace is said to belong to God in the Old Testament and in Jewish literature and we proceed to indicate its meaning.

There are several words in the Old Testament which might be discussed, but those which have the most bearing on our subject are *ḥen* and *ḥesedh*. The former is translated favour [1] and Grace.[2] It denotes a kindly disposition manifested in kindly acts; it is favour bestowed when it is unearned and might be withheld. In the Pentateuch and Historical Books it mostly indicates a favour granted by a superior to an

[1] 26 times. [2] 38 times.

inferior. In this sense it is used to express the objective character of Jahweh's Grace. Noah found *ḥen* in the eyes of the Lord.[1] We must regard the call of Abraham as an act of *ḥen*. Deutero-Isaiah indicates the source whence the stream reached Abraham as Jahweh's love.[2] God gave Israel favour in the sight of the Egyptians [3] and in the borrowing of jewels.[4] Moses prayed for a revelation of Jahweh's glory as a token of acceptance : [5] he felt that Jahweh had withdrawn His favour in *laying the sins of Israel upon him*.[6] Gideon sought signs of acceptableness in God's sight.[7] David attributed his deliverance during Absalom's revolt to finding favour in God's eyes.[8] Joseph found *ḥen* in the sight of Potiphar.[9] Ruth found it before Boaz.[10] Esther found it in the eyes of the Persian king.[11] In some of the great prophets *ḥen* is never used. The Psalter uses it twice of God ; in His favour is life ; and to the longing soul God gives grace and glory.[12] In the Wisdom Literature acceptance in Jahweh's sight is revealed in material prosperity and long life, and has a strong utilitarian tinge.

The verb *ḥanan*, especially when used by the soul at prayer, as it frequently is used in the Psalter, has a richer spiritual content. It is used by Jacob to denote God's Providence, whereby he has enough and a gift to spare for Esau.[13] The same thought comes out in the prayer for deliverance from bodily affliction, trouble, and calamity ;[14] and that Jahweh will shew favour by saving men from their enemies, or destroying such enemies by His own hand ;[15] God is asked to shew no favour to the wicked ; but " to raise me up that I may requite my enemies." [16]

But men seek acceptance in the sight of God by penitence. David fasted and wept, " for I said who knoweth whether the Lord will not be gracious unto me that the child may live."[17]

[1] Gen. 6. 8. [2] Isa. 41. 8. [3] Ex. 3. 21.
[4] Ex. 11. 3. [5] Ex. 33. 12 f. [6] Num. 11. 11.
[7] Jud. 6. 17. [8] 2 Sam. 15. 25. [9] Gen. 39. 4.
[10] Ruth 2. 10. [11] 5. 8 ; 7. 3. [12] 30. 5 ; 84. 11.
[13] Gen. 33. 5, 11. [14] Isa. 33. 2 ; Ps. 9. 14 ; 25. 16 ; 31. 10.
[15] Ps. 56. 2 ; 57. 2f. [16] Ps. 59. 6 ; 41. 11. [17] 2 Sam. 12. 22.

As the servant to his master, as the maid to her mistress, "so our eyes are unto the Lord our God until He be gracious unto us . . . for we are filled exceedingly with contempt" (for sin).[1] Psalm 51 is the prayer of the penitent that God will be gracious according to His *hesedh*.[2] There are prayers for Jahweh's favour against the day of entering Sheol.[3] Occasionally some ethical condition is laid down as essential to finding acceptance in Jahweh's sight.[4] In one case only is Jahweh said to be gracious to Israel because of His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob.[5]

The Hithpa'el use of *ḥanan* gives the most spiritual connotation to the idea of finding Jahweh's favour. In an intensity of prayer the suppliant asks that God will "incline towards him." Because God hid His face the Psalmist was troubled, and cried, and implored the Lord to be gracious.[6] At the opening of the Temple it was said to Solomon that God had heard his prayer, imploring His Grace.[7] Solomon asks that when Israel has been smitten before the enemy on account of sin, and implores Jahweh's Grace in the Temple, that God will forgive their sins.[8] His prayer was a casting of the whole nation on God's unmerited love. Moses casts himself on the same love, when he asks to see the good land beyond Jordan.[9] It is thus that Hosea interprets Jacob's wrestle on the banks of the Jabbok.[10] Bildad thinks that if Job were to cast himself on the unmerited love of the Almighty, God would awake for Him.[11] There is the same urgency in Esther's prayer before the king, when she implored his favour with tears.[12] It is in this sense of casting oneself on unmerited affection that we must distinguish the Hithpa'el of *ḥanan*, from the similar form of *palal*, to appeal to God's attributes.

We see that *ḥen* has no evangelical significance; it is not used of redemption from sin; and it fails to deepen in meaning as the redemptive purpose of God in the Old Testament is

[1] Ps. 123. 2.
[2] 51. 3; cf. 6. 3; 31. 10; 83. 3, 16.
[3] 30. 11.
[4] Amos 5. 5; Isa. 27. 11.; Ps. 119. 29.
[5] 2 Kings 13. 3.
[6] 30. 9.
[7] 1 Kings 9. 3.
[8] 1 Kings 8. 33, 47.
[9] Deut. 3. 23.
[10] 12. 4.
[11] 8. 5.
[12] 8. 3; 4. 8.

unveiled. Perhaps our best English word for *ḥen* is acceptance or acceptableness, denoting a quality in the *recipient*, which finds approval in the eyes of a superior. We do not read of a superior shewing *ḥen* to an inferior, *the latter always finds it in the presence of the former*. Hence it is not in *ḥen*, not even in the Hithpa'el of the verb, where the most intensive meaning is brought out, that we find the redemptive motive of Jahweh manifesting itself. This word does not indicate any putting forth of the gracious will of God in order that Israel should be His peculiar people and His own possession. Yet, *charis*, which is the most significant term in the New Testament for the study of Grace, is the LXX rendering of *ḥen*.

We turn now to *ḥesedh* which is translated most frequently in the LXX by *eleos*, and in the Vulgate by *misericordia*. It is rendered variously as mercy,[1] kindness,[2] loving-kindness,[3] goodness,[4] and on three occasions, favour.[5] These various meanings of *ḥesedh* are unfortunate for the English reader.[6] Divine mercy is mostly regarded as synonymous with forgiveness of sin, while *ḥesedh* is translated mercy when sin is not under discussion. In the Psalter, *ḥesedh* is one of a trinity of Jahweh's attributes, the others being righteousness and truth.[7] Hence, *ḥesedh* is a more comprehensive term than mercy. When used of God's relation to man it denotes loving-kindness or Grace. This meaning comes out in the declaration to Moses, following the worship of the golden calf : " The Lord, the Lord, a God full of compassion and gracious (*ḥanun*), slow to anger and plenteous in *ḥesedh* and truth ; keeping *ḥesedh* for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin."[8] Other words in this passage are used for the pardon of sin ; but *ḥesedh* affirms a characteristic attribute of the Divine Nature. Thus early, *ḥesedh* is revealed as an essential element in the character of Jahweh ; it was

[1] Very frequently. [2] 38 times. [3] 30 times.
[4] 12 times. [5] Esther 2. 17 ; Job 10. 22 ; Dan. 1. 9.
[6] Whenever *ḥesedh* is used of God the American revisers translate it loving-kindness.
[7] 85. 10 ; 40. 10. [8] Exod. 34. 6 f.

no afterthought, as something evolved out of pity for human nature ; it was central to the Divine Will as it was revealed to Moses.

Ḥesedh is the good news in the preaching of Hosea, who regarded it as the ground of Jahweh's covenant-relation with Israel. It is also the inspiration of his ethical teaching, as is seen in his enunciation of the demands of Jahweh's loving-kindness upon the allegiance of Israel. He conceives the reception of Jahweh's *ḥesedh*, expressed in the covenant, as laying Israel under ethical obligations which cannot be repudiated without doom and judgment. To Hosea *ḥesedh* denotes " the bonds of personal affection . . . more than can be expressed in the forms of legal obligation. . . . Jahweh and Israel form, as it were, one community and *ḥesedh* is the bond by which the whole community is knit together." [1] Jahweh has taken Israel for His bride and His *ḥesedh* to her must invoke her loyalty to Him.[2]

The historical books rarely use *ḥesedh*. It is seen that God's chastisements are not inconsistent with His loving-kindness, which shall not depart from the house of David.[3] In the dedicatory prayer of the Temple, Jahweh is addressed as one who keeps covenant and *ḥesedh* with His servants that walk before Him with all their heart.[4]

The content of *ḥesedh* is deepest and richest in the Psalter. God is adored as ' my loving-kindness.' [5] *Ḥesedh* establishes the king ; [6] deserves the gratitude and praise of men ; [7] is precious ; [8] sustains those who slip ; [9] is worthy of hope ; [10] it accomplishes redemption ; [11] it quickens man's spiritual life ; [12] Psalm 136 is a remarkable eulogy to Jahweh's *ḥesedh* ; it is mighty over Israel ; [13] it fills the earth ; [14] it endureth for ever ; [15] it sanctifieth the soul ; it embraces every living thing.[16]

[1] W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, 161 f. [2] Cf. Hosea 6. 6 ; 12. 6.
[3] 2 Sam. 7. 15 ; 22. 51 ; 1 Kings 3. 6. [4] 1 Kings 8. 23.
[5] 144. 2 ; 59. 18 ; 63. 13. [6] 21. 8. [7] 107. 8 f. ; 31. 8.
[8] 36. 8. [9] 94. 18. [10] 33. 18 ; 13. 5 ; 147. 11 ; 52. 10.
[11] 31. 16 ; 44. 26 ; 51. 1 ; 25. 6 f. [12] 119. 88, 159.
[13] 117. [14] 119. 64. [15] 118. 1–4. [16] 145. 7–16 ; 136. 25.

It is clear that *ḥesedh*, not *ḥen*, is the word which must be interpreted as expressing the motive of God towards Israel as it was realized in the covenant-relation ; and *charis* in the New Testament is really in line with the spiritual development of *ḥesedh*.

No mere investigation of terms, however, can suffice for our inquiry. Nothing short of a comprehensive view of the whole field of Israel's religious experience would be necessary to do justice to the Old Testament Doctrine of Grace. " Both sin and grace require a survey of the whole history of religion in any given period for their adequate doctrinal statement." [1] In the prophets, especially in Deutero-Isaiah and Jonah, in the Psalter and Job, there are rich mines for the working out of the Doctrine of Grace ; but we are obviously precluded from any such inquiry. It is necessary, however, to draw attention to the evolution of Grace as progress. This is not the same thing as an evolution of religion, as we must also point out. There is an evolution of religion which is not progress ; but in those sections of the Old Testament where the Grace of Jahweh is evolved there is ethical development. There are writers in the Old Testament to whom the unearned goodness of God, flowing into the heart, is the sole inspiration of moral progress. Behind the strongest ethical conceptions of Isaiah, for instance, is the experience of Jahweh's holy and cleansing loving-kindness. The principles of national righteousness, social obligation, and economic justice are most clearly enunciated in the prophets who have experienced the regenerating power of Jahweh's *ḥesedh*. The only instance of the prophetic Doctrine of Grace that space permits, however, we take from Deutero-Isaiah, mainly because the experience of the Suffering Servant was clearly present to our Lord's mind. Then we must draw attention to the fact that the religious life of Israel ebbs as well as flows ; and that it furnishes an illustration of the evolution of religion but not of Grace. It is essential, in order to gain the truest possible

[1] H. W. Robinson, *Christian Doctrine of Man*, 42.

perspective for our investigation of the synoptic sources, to understand the above statement in the light of the Priestly Code and Jewish literature.

B. The Doctrine of Divine Grace in Deutero-Isaiah

There is no part of the Old Testament where the doctrine of Jahweh's Grace to Israel is set forth so forcibly as in Deutero-Isaiah. The Book of Jonah may define the scope of the divine purpose more explicitly, bringing out the obligation which Jahweh's generous goodness lays upon Israel towards the great heathen world, but for insight into the problems of divine Grace and history we must turn to the great evangelical prophet of the exile. For one thing, time and tide were with him. He beholds the stream of Jahweh's loving-kindness rising to irresistible flood, bringing down Cyrus on its bosom, leaving much human wreckage in its course, stripping Babylon, Lady of Kingdoms, until her shame is seen and never ceasing its surge until Israel is carried home. The arguments of the prophet presuppose a profound spiritual temper in the pious remnant. Bereft of the Temple shrine with its impressive drama of worship, the pious had become more conscious than ever of the intrinsic character of spiritual communion with Jahweh. Jeremiah's message had found its soil in the hearts of the exiles : " I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it." During the captivity a new generation had arisen with a new heart and a new spirit. Hence, the objective manifestation of Jahweh's Grace in Deutero-Isaiah is inseparable from the deepening subjective experience of the pious. The occasion made the prophecy intensely national on the one hand ; but the prophet is under no delusion as to the universal reach of those principles according to which the Grace of Jahweh operates towards and in Israel.

The prophet proclaims himself the announcer of good-

tidings, and his first utterance is full of Grace : " Speak ye to the heart of Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her time of service is accomplished." [1] He then proceeds to bring out an objective aspect of divine Grace which has received too little attention of late, showing its operation in history in the terms of divine will or motive. Jahweh's attitude to Israel was full of compassion. He yearned over her. But could He deliver her from Babylon ? Yes, such was the divine tenderness that Jahweh feeds " His flock like a shepherd, He shall gather the lambs in His arm, and carry them in His bosom, He shall gently lead those that give suck." And the prophet reasons that the will and energy of God are equal to the task of carrying the people home. It is in the *power of will* that Jahweh is the Incomparable. Heathen gods have no strength. On the other hand, Jahweh fainteth not, neither is weary ; by the greatness of His might not one of the heavenly host is lacking. He holds princes and peoples and stars in His hand. The gods of the heathen can neither foretell a thing nor bring it to pass. Jahweh can do both. He purposes to call Cyrus and does it. " I have raised him up in righteousness and I will make straight all his ways : he shall build my city, and he shall let my exiles go free, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of Hosts." [2] Cyrus, the mightiest political force of that day, was under the control of Jahweh, and would perform all His good pleasure.

The Grace of Jahweh alone explains Israel's existence as a nation. He claims to have chosen Israel and formed him from the womb. Never is Israel regarded as choosing Jahweh. The Divine motive is pressed far back of Sinai and its covenant unto the rock whence Israel was hewn.[3]

Abraham was Jahweh's friend, even from the ends of the earth He had chosen him as the father of Jacob. Jahweh's choice of the nation was no afterthought. Israel's physical existence was a gift, and was meant to enshrine Jahweh's motive from the foundation of the world. As the spiritual horizon grows clearer to the vision of our prophet, the political

[1] 40. 1. [2] 45. 13. [3] 51. 1.

existence of Israel becomes less of an end and more of a means for giving effect to the universal scope of Jahweh's purpose. More clearly than any of his predecessors, Deutero-Isaiah sees the true place of Israel in the development of the Divine purpose. He is the bearer of the good-tidings of the Restoration; he glows at the prospective swoop of Cyrus on Babylon and the rebuilding of the holy city, but, momentous as these events are, they are included in a divine teleology which reaches to further ends. We have but to compare the teaching of Deutero-Isaiah with Ezekiel's closing picture of the Restoration to learn how much more inward and comprehensive is his reading of history. The theme of these chapters is handled, the facts marshalled, the history of the race read and projected by one who sees events from the standpoint of the divine motive in relation to mankind rather than from the exclusive point of view of Israel.

At the same time, Jahweh's immediate concern is with Israel. The current of divine Grace bears the nation onward. God sees Israel's deplorable condition in Babylon, robbed and spoiled and impotent;[1] yet precious in His sight.[2] He knew from the beginning how obstinate and stiff-necked she was,[3] but He had not forgotten her. She is graven on the palms of His hands.[4] He had hid His face in wrath for a moment, but He will gather her with everlasting loving-kindness.[5] And His will is equal to His compassionate disposition. His arm is not shortened that it cannot redeem.[6]

Deutero-Isaiah's distinctive contribution to the Doctrine of Grace lies in his clear penetration of its objective and subjective operations. Grace is not something which is given for nothing, nor is it received for nothing. There is nothing arbitrary in God's Grace. The prophet never loses sight for a moment of the great principles involved in his evangelism. He discerns that even the Grace of Jahweh cannot deny His

[1] 42. 22. [2] 43. 4. [3] 48. 4.
[4] 49. 15. [5] 54. 7 f. [6] 50. 2; 53. 1.

righteousness and truth : it does not cancel human guilt unless certain subjective conditions make forgiveness possible ; it only furthers its end through Israel as the nation closes with its demands, working outwardly the Grace which works inwardly. Deutero-Isaiah realized this as did no other prophet in the Old Testament. He thus confronts the cardinal question of that generation ; and the problem did not present itself as one between the Sovereignty of God and human freedom. In the first place, this evangelist of the exile sees the cost of Jahweh's Grace to Himself ; then, he sees the suffering of the Servant as the working out of the divine motive to save transgressors. The prophet's eye did not linger too long on the past, he is inspired to set forth the timeless principle according to which the Grace of God operates. Forgiveness is a gracious act of God, but the Grace which forgives makes the most appalling demands on the human will. Deutero-Isaiah saw that the central appeal of Grace was to the will of Israel ; in the case of the pious it appealed to the will to suffer ; in the case of the nation it appealed to the will to repent.

There are remarkable passages which develop the objective character of Grace in relation to the suffering of God. The sufferings of the Servant no more than reflect the passions of the Divine Being. The emotions of God are agitated as His will moves to its goal. Jahweh says that it is no light thing that He should realize His eternal motive in the destiny of Israel. But however terrible the cost of progress, the prophet sees that Jahweh lays no suffering upon others which He does not bear Himself. Could the Grace of the Divine Nature be expressed more vividly than when Jahweh says, " I have long time held my peace : I was silent, I restrained myself : like a woman in travail I gasp and pant and palpitate together." [1] The stupendous expenditure of moral energy suggested in these words shews the cost of Jahweh's Grace to Himself. He gave Israel birth and He takes upon Himself the anguish of

[1] 42. 14.

carrying and delivering her. For her sake He passes through rivers and through fire, which but for His presence would finally submerge her.[1] The writer of the closing chapters of Isaiah accentuates this suffering on the part of God. In all the affliction of His people Jahweh is afflicted. In His agony to achieve His motive His raiment is bespattered with the lifeblood of nations. At such a cost is His Grace available for Israel.

The climax of the argument for the objective reality of divine Grace in Deutero-Isaiah is Jahweh's appeal to the consistency of His own character and motive. Such reasoning is found in Isaiah and Jeremiah, and later in Ezekiel. Isaiah had proclaimed to Hezekiah that the inviolability of Jerusalem rested on the consistency of the divine will. Jahweh would never renounce His covenant: "For I will defend this city to save it *for mine own sake* and for my servant David's sake."[2] On that occasion, Sennacherib's army had melted away from before Jerusalem. The city now lay in ruins, a widow bereft of her children, but the days of her mourning are now drawing to a close. Jahweh has not cast her children off, but has refined them in captivity for His own sake. It is His purpose to bring them home again, for He cannot give His glory to another. "*For mine own sake, for mine own sake* will I do it, for how should my name be profaned and my glory will I not give to another."[3] His motive is like Himself, eternally consistent.

The strength of the prophet's evangelism must be traced to this conviction of the consistency of the divine will. At terrible cost to Himself, Jahweh will keep His covenant. And it is the task of the prophet to convince the people that nothing can deter the will of Jahweh to carry them home. Their subjective condition now made that possible, for their time of service was expired. There had been much in their experience to blur the objective magnificence of divine Grace.

[1] 43. 2. [2] 37. 25. [3] 48. 9.

Blind they might be still to its modes of operation. But the tramp of Cyrus' armies coming from the north is music to the soul of the prophet. In the new political crisis which is breaking on the horizon he is inspired to discern the progress of the divine will towards its goal.

The subjective aspect of divine Grace in Deutero-Isaiah is brought out most prominently in the Servant songs. After all, the greatest element in the sufferings of the Servant is not physical. We must get behind His wounds and shame, visible effects, to the invisible energies which urge Him onwards. When this is done we discover that the mightiest thing in the Servant is His inspired will. "I was not rebellious," He says, "I gave My back to the smiters, and My cheeks to them that plucked out the hair: I hid not My face from shame and spitting—I have set My face like a flint." [1] By what means? By the help of Jahweh. The divine pressure revealed in these verses is seen in our Lord, who was straitened till His task was done. That this strength of will put forth by the Servant is the psychological effect of Jahweh's Grace comes out in the relation of the above passages to Jahweh's promises to put His spirit upon His Servant, and to give Him as a light to the Gentiles that salvation may reach to the ends of the earth.[2]

The suffering Servant in chapter 53 is working out the Grace of Jahweh into the profoundest ethical values. "It *pleased* the Lord to bruise him," and we only understand the nature of this bruising as we regard the subjective travail of the Servant. Such passion is the resultant of the divine motive. In other words Jahweh's Grace inspires the will of the Servant to put forth the utmost expenditure of moral energy.

Chapter 53, then, is the charter of the pious remnant who know their humiliation and suffering to have intrinsic values within the realm of divine ends. They know their passion to be the cost to the Church of their day of Jahweh's everlasting motive to redeem. The division of the population into the

[1] 50. 4–7. [2] 49. 6.

pious and the transgressors may strike us as subjective and arbitrary, but it stands for the division between the Church and the nation which was real for the pious remnant.

Now the pious within Israel heard the call to suffer, that the nation might be led away from sin into complete surrender to Jahweh. It was in the nature of their experience of divine Grace that they should do so. Through fellowship with God they had learnt the nature of that obedience which He required—even vicarious suffering unto death. But as they became conscious of their calling, they became conscious too of the access of spiritual energies which inspired them to fulfil it. The refusal to suffer would have closed the avenues of inflowing Grace. Hence Jahweh's Grace makes its central challenge to the human will, and through the surrendered will Supernatural energies accomplish divine progress. There is a reciprocity of action between Jahweh and the pious remnant, between Grace and the will to suffer, between Evangelism and its Ethic. Deutero-Isaiah has left far behind all notions of Grace as mere favour, summary action on the part of God to secure material prosperity or political supremacy for Israel. He sees clearly that the Grace of Jahweh, with all its objective wonders, creates a task for the Jewish Church which wounds and afflicts and chastises with many stripes. The price of the Church's loyalty, learned in closest communion with Jahweh, is the will to suffer, and to die rather than fail His purpose.

The Grace of Jahweh is manifested further in the final majesty and glory of the pious remnant. The humiliation of the Servant, stricken, smitten, loaded with grief, promised no exaltation. But when chapter 53 was written, Jahweh had vindicated the suffering Servant. Through their travail the pious had been led to triumph and glory. Box [1] holds that 53. 1 refers to something which had been said in the past, and which appeared incredible at the time it was uttered.

[1] Isa., *in loco*.

"Who could have believed what we heard?" "So that chapter 53 develops in a masterly way the paradox that the supreme sufferings of the martyr have supreme value."

C. Doctrine of Grace in the Priestly Code

The Priestly Code is concerned with God's holy relation to Israel; and divine Love and Grace are its foundations. The object of the Code is traced to the gracious motive of God; and when it was given there was no consciousness of antithesis between Law and Grace. Reading the casuistry of the Pharisees back into P. (=Priestly Code) we can see the tendencies which only needed an opportunity for the development of the Jewish Doctrine of Merit. Such perils, however, were present to the eighth-century prophets long before the Code received its final form. Any system which associates ceremonial with moral values is in constant danger of sacrificing the latter to the former; but this does not invalidate the purity of the motive which underlies the system.

The legislation of P. rested on the assumption that Israel was already, by means of the covenant, in a state of Grace. The object of the Code was to lay down the conditions by which Israel could continue to abide in the same state. Through P. the Grace of God was meant to operate to the end of conserving a peculiar people, holy as God was holy. Space and time, property and life, and Israel as a nation were conceived as belonging to Jahweh in His own right. In lieu, however, of the surrender of the whole of time and property, and the worship of the whole nation, while still setting forth His claim to the whole, Jahweh consecrated to Himself Holy Places and Holy Days, an oblation of property and an order of priesthood. The Holy of Holies was entered once during the year by the High Priest; the holy place was allotted to the priests proper; the outer court was allocated to the Levites, servants of the priests, and these communicated

with the nation as a whole. This was a well-regulated system to preserve the solidarity of the holy people in a state of Grace.

Then, how did a man enter into this state of Grace ? Did he share in the holiness of Jahweh by virtue of blood-relationship ? It is clear that P. regarded every Israelite as born into a potential state of Grace, which circumcision made actual. It is vital to remember that in this way an Israelite, according to P., became acceptable to God. It was in this way that prevenient Grace was provided for him. Not by any effort of his own, being too young to be capable of self-effort, but by virtue of the covenant-relation into which he was born, and initiated by circumcision, he was a partaker in covenant-Grace. For "neither in P. nor in Ezekiel are the ritual institutions means of salvation, they express the state of salvation, which is altogether of God, and their performance merely conserves it." [1] Hence it is by compliance with the Priestly Code, the divinely appointed means of communion between the soul and God, that man receives sustaining and sanctifying Grace. P. made it clear to the Israelite in what way Grace was available for him. We must remember that the Code was regulative and not originative. It was God's way of conserving for the Israelite the covenant-Grace which was his by birth.

But while P. conserved the solidarity of the holy people before God, it also recognized that the individual might incur ceremonial and moral culpability which suspended him from communion with the people, and from appearing before Jahweh. It also recognized that in extreme cases the individual placed himself outside the scope of the Priestly Code and forfeited the right to live. P. provides atonement only for what are called sins of error ; [2] these are the acts of a man who acknowledges the divine authorship and authority of the Law, and falls through infirmity. The sin-offering covers all such minor offences,[3] and atones for sins of ignorance.[4] The guilt-offering covers those offences which admit of reparation,

[1] A. B. Davidson. Hastings *B.D.*, I, 513 b. [2] Num. 15. 22.
[3] Lev. 5. 1–6. [4] Lev. 4. 2, 22, 27.

and involves total restitution plus one-fifth of the whole.[1] The sins enumerated in Leviticus 6. 4 come under *our* conception of wilful sins. Kautzsch claims that lying and cheating are intentional sins, and do not belong to the category of unwitting or hastily committed deeds.[2] Still, in whichever category we place them, by priestly manipulation of the sacrificial blood,[3] according to P., a covering tak s place and these sins are forgiven.[4] Any temporary exclusion from the privileges and blessings of the covenant is thereby ended, and the individual restored to a full state of Grace.

For intentional sins P. has no promise of Grace. The offender's life is forfeit. The modern connotation of 'intentional' will not carry us far towards any solution of P.'s problem, as the suggestion of Kautzsch implies. The distinction between sins of ignorance and intention, says Davidson, must be traced "to the state of mind of the transgressor." Intentional sins expressed an inward defiance of P. and its Author. The nature of this defiance is seen in the act of the man gathering sticks on the Sabbath day, for which he was stoned by the congregation till he died, *as the Lord commanded Moses.*[5] Idolatry was the sin of the high hand; it was defiance of the first commandment, and for its committal there was no place of repentance. It is as vital to remember how a man becomes cut off from covenant-Grace as how it becomes available for him. As an intentional sinner he forfeits right to this earthly existence. The intentional sinner in Israel raised much difficulty, and it was only possible to solve his exclusion from covenant-Grace on the lines of determinism.

We must seek the explanation of the above views on Grace in relation to the Doctrine of Divine Holiness. Jahweh's transcendence was pushed so far that He could have no dealing whatever with men who had intentionally offended His Holiness. No mediation was possible; man was helpless before His sin, finally cast off by Jahweh, who was as unable

[1] Lev. 6. R.V. [2] *B.D.*, Extra Vol., 721.
[3] Lev. 4. 6, 16–20. [4] Lev. 6. 7. [5] Num. 15. 32 f.

to approach the sinner as the sinner was unable to approach Him. Such was the result of P.'s effort to procure at all costs the particularism which was felt to be necessary to save revealed religion in the greatest crisis of its history. This attempt had the utmost consequences for the Doctrine of Grace in Jewish literature.

III

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE IN JEWISH LITERATURE

IN Jewish literature *charis* retains its Old Testament connotation of finding favour, but it also reveals signs of Greek influence. A few examples will suffice to shew this.

1. It indicates acceptableness, lovableness, charm, and beauty in the one who finds favour. Because of divinely given strength Israel finds favour in the sight of the king of Babylon and his son.[1] Jonathan finds favour in the sight of the two kings, because of his gift.[2] A wise and good wife finds favour in the eyes of her husband, she is a woman of grace.[3]

2. It means good-will, kindness, bounty, in the heart of the donor. A gift to the poor has grace in the sight of all men.[4] Bounty is as a garden of blessings.[5] Raphael visited Tobias and his wife not by any favour of his own but by the will of God.[6]

3. As the product of (1) and (2), it denotes kindnesses, gifts, favours *bestowed*. When the father, who has dutifully taught his son, dies, he leaves an offspring to requite kindness to his friends.[7] God shews grace and mercy to His chosen.[8] The grace which belongs to Wisdom is a divine gift.[9] God rewards the faithful eunuch with 'a peculiar favour.'

4. *Charis* is often used as thanks for favours received.

[1] Baruch 1. 12.
[2] I Macc. 10. 60.
[3] B. Sira 7. 19; 26. 13.
[4] Sira 7. 33.
[5] Sira 40. 17.
[6] Tobit 12. 18.
[7] Sira 30. 6.
[8] Wis. 3. 9.
[9] Wisd. 8. 21.

There is no clear instance in the LXX of *charis* used of unmerited favour. Wisdom 8. 21 would seem to be the best case. Still, throughout Jewish literature the idea of covenant-Grace runs like a golden thread ; it is, therefore, necessary to review the Doctrine of Grace in the legalistic and apocalyptic sections of Palestinian literature.

At first, neither side of Jewish thought was conscious of any antagonism in the other, both being based on the eternal validity of the Law. Later, before the Christian era, each side of Judaism developed its own tendencies, and in the end they considerably diverged. After the fall of Jerusalem, Legalistic Pharisaism passed into Talmudic Judaism. Jewish apocalyptic held on to the conviction that, " the Most High hath not made one world but two " ; [1] and the enthusiasm of its hope was not without considerable influence during the days of the historic ministry of Jesus.

A. Legalistic Pharisaism

It would be interesting to trace the evolution of the two classes of sinners in Israel. P., however, has brought us thus far ; to commit unintentional sins, and satisfy P.'s demands, by which atonement was made for them, was to remain in the Jewish Church, and within that Church one dwelt in a state of Grace ; to commit intentional sin was to be thrust irrevocably beyond the reach of divine mercy.

Ben Sira goes so far as to teach the predestination of these two classes within Israel.[2] There is no fellowship between them.[3] Isaac can offer Esau no hope, for he has sinned a sin unto death.[4] Eternal death is reserved for the Israelite who intentionally sins by working on the Sabbath.[5] Fourth Ezra regards the number of Elect within Israel as predetermined ; [6] God created the world for the sake of the righteous remnant.[7]

[1] IV Ezra 7. 50.
[2] 33. 11–15 ; 39. 25
[3] 13. 17.
[4] Jubilees 26. 34.
[5] 2. 27
[6] 4. 33–50.
[7] II Baruch 14. 19 ; 15. 7 ; 21. 24.

This distinction between the nature of sins or sinners is nowhere more remarkable than in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Reuben sinned in ignorance; he was punished, being sick unto death for seven months, and was only saved through the merit of the prayers of Jacob, and strict observance of the Law for seven years.[1] Zebulon is not conscious of sin save in thought, which means he has not sinned intentionally.[2] A sacrificial service is offered in heaven by the angels for all the sins of ignorance committed by the righteous.[3] God had mercy on Judah for his great sin because he did it in ignorance.[4] In Asher the sins of ignorance and intention are traced to the good and evil yezer respectively.[5] All things are by twos; there are two yezers [6] and two ways, and the evil yezer must be destroyed by obedience to the Torah.

In the Maccabean period the antagonism between the Church and the rulers is deep and fierce. Those who sympathize with Antiochus Epiphanes are the lawless men within Israel;[7] they are pestilential Jews,[8] breakers of the law.[9] Judith is written to shew that the nation is completely helpless apart from the Church with its scrupulous obedience to the Torah. In I Enoch the Pharisaic party are the righteous and represent the Church; the Sadducees, rulers of the nation and abettors of Hellenism, are apostates and paganisers. The sinners within Israel are a wealthy prosperous group which oppresses the faithful. In all this tumult the Torah as a sword divides the Church from the nation.[10] The same distinction is observed in the Psalter of Solomon. The righteous are the Chasids (men who do *ḥesedh*), who uphold the authority of the Torah, and declare that no religious experience is possible outside its sanctions; the Sadducees are guilty of intentional sins;[11] they shall be overthrown be-

[1] Test. R. Ch. I. [2] Test. Z., 1. 4.
[3] Test. Levi., 3. 5 f. [4] Test. Jud. 19. 4. [5] Ch. I.
[6] Test. Asher 3. 2; cf., B. Sira 21, 11. The two yezers express the Jewish doctrine of two inclinations in man; one good, the other evil.
[7] I Macc. 2. 44; 7. 5. [8] 10. 61. [9] 11. 21.
[10] I Enoch 103. 14 f. [11] 4. 1 f.

cause they sin knowingly,[1] and their destruction shall be for ever.[2]

The existence of these two classes within Israel has deep significance for any understanding of the Jewish Doctrines of Grace and Merit. It is only by grasping this difference between the pious and the irrevocable transgressors, as it presented itself in Israel, that we shall understand the teaching on merit in Jewish literature. The usual connotation of merit would seem to extend to all Jews alike ; but it is clear that the Jewish Church never gave it any such application in the case of intentional sinners. Moreover, the deterministic explanation of the intentional sinner within Israel shews the difficulty that was felt concerning him in relation to covenant-Grace.

The selection of a few passages will be sufficient to indicate the character of the Jewish Doctrine of Merit. Ben Sira teaches that prayer and alms win merit.[3] Alms delivers from affliction and fights a man's enemies.[4] To honour parents is atonement for sin.[5] Visitation of the sick is merit.[6] The vocation of the scribe compared with that of the artisan is meritorious.[7] There was *no merit* to the pious, however, in helping the sinner.[8] There are passages which attach merit to good works—those kindly acts which outrun any legal code ; such good works, however, are never credited to those who commit intentional sin.

Tobit wreathes the Doctrine of Merit round the three pillars of Judaism. Rich and poor alike must give alms, i.e. righteousness. Alms and prayer and fasting are better than gold.[9]

In Jubilees the Torah is pre-existent and eternal. From eternity Jahweh ordained that circumcision should be performed on the eighth day, and no forgiveness was possible for failing to observe this precept.[10] Alms is equivalent to

[1] 13. 6 f.
[2] 3. 13.
[3] 7. 10.
[4] 3. 30; 29. 12–13.
[5] 3. 3, 14–16.
[6] 7. 35.
[7] 38. 24–39. 5.
[8] 12. 4–7.
[9] 12. 8 ff.
[10] 15. 26.

righteousness, and both to treasure in heaven.[1] In I Maccabees the Doctrine of Merit is bound up with allegiance to the Torah: Providence helps those who fight for the laws.[2] Judas' prayer against Lysias, when the people fasted and put on sackcloth and spread out the roll of the law, was an appeal that God would vindicate the merit of the law-keepers against those who defied it.[3] God balances the action of those men who keep the Torah.[4] He who does righteousness lays up treasure of life with the Lord.[5] The righteous keep the law and thereby win an answer to prayer. Through merit a man leaves this world in confidence.[6] These passages shew the unity of the Law and God; that "wheresoever the Law was practised there the Divine Presence was *ipso facto* manifesting itself,"[7] and Grace was felt a reality.

Still, this Doctrine of Merit was not easily reconciled with experience, and raised difficulties for faith in respect to the sinner, as is seen in the Zacuth of the Fathers. Later Rabbinical writings narrowed this merit to the Patriarchs; but as early as Ben Sira, the prosperity and peace of Solomon's reign are ascribed to the merits of David.[8] Before Solomon sinned he had accumulated much merit; afterwards, all his prosperity was due to his father's merit. No merit could be accumulated by the impious Israelite.

These passages shew that it is only as the Israelite abides in covenant-Grace that his deeds have merit in the sight of God. Outside that condition there is no merit. This is confirmed by other passages which search human motive and attach profoundly ethical values to character. Ben Sira agrees with Old Testament views on repentance. A man cannot sin and say I will repent.[9] "Say not, He will look

[1] Tes. Levi 13. 5. [2] 3. 21 f.
[3] 3. 44–54. [4] Pss. Sol. 5. 6. [5] Pss. Sol. 9. 9.
[6] II Baruch 51. 3; 63. 3–5; 85. 2; 14. 12.
[7] Oesterley, *Parting of the Roads*, 92; cf. II Baruch 85. 3.
[8] 47. 12. See Box and Oesterley *in loco*. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Charles, Oxford. All references to Commentaries are from this work.
[9] 5. 4–7.

upon the multitude of my gifts." [1] The prosperity and rule of nations are attributed to moral goodness.[2] Ben Sira's grasp of the inward character of spiritual experience is manifested in his appeal to men, to return unto the Lord and forsake sins.[3] They must add no more to their sin, but flee from it as from the face of a serpent.[4] No secret sin shall go unpunished.[5] His reference to the evil eye reveals a deeply moral estimate of lust.[6] Then, God has no delight in the offerings of the ungodly, nor can He be corrupted with bribes.[7] " It is futile to pass through the ritual act of purification, if defilement is to be immediately contracted again." [8]

In the Testaments, this emphasis on motive frequently reminds us of the teaching of Jesus. The Testament of Gad has a " passage of truly epoch-making import . . . that a man can only receive divine forgiveness on the condition that he forgives his neighbour. Indeed in their essential aspects these two forgivenesses are seen to be one and the same." [9] This view of the inwardness of spiritual experience is also most pronounced in Baruch 1. 15–3. 8. The author disavows the Zacuth of the fathers.[10] Sin rises from the thoughts of the wicked heart.[11] An appeal is made to God to deliver Israel for His own sake, a familiar thought in Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The remnant pleads no merit, but cries in anguish to a gracious God against whom the people have sinned.[12]

The above passages are evidence of a deep spiritual experience which no pure Doctrine of Merit can fully explain.

[1] 7. 8 f. [2] 10. 8.
[3] 17. 25–29; cf. Box and Oesterley, p. 331, for B. Sira's teaching on repentance.
[4] 21. 1–3. [5] 23. 18–24. [6] 31. 13.
[7] 34. 18–26. [8] Box and Oesterley, on 34. 25 f.
[9] Gad 6. 3–6. See Charles *in loco* and p. 292. Some critics see in a passage like this the Christian editing of the Testaments.
[10] 2. 19. The Jewish doctrine of the Zacuth of the fathers was that the patriarchs had accumulated merit which was stored up on behalf of their descendants. Cf. p. 27, where Reuben was saved through the merit of the prayers of Jacob.
[11] 2. 8. [12] 3. 2.

They help to throw into relief that *genuine spiritual* background of Jewish doctrine which has not always received the attention it deserves at the hands of Christian exegetes. Abstracted from the rest of Jewish teaching, the passages on merit imply that a man has his destiny in his own hands at any time of his career, and that he can initiate and sustain his own spiritual life by observance of the Torah. Whatever witness Rabbinical writings offer to such a thoroughgoing doctrine of salvation by works, Jewish literature would repudiate any such idea. When the angel upholds the result of pure Legalism, Salathiel appeals against it to the divine compassion;[1] he realizes the inherent weakness of the Law as a redemptive power, "and this attitude of mind was by no means so rare and isolated a phenomenon in contemporary Judaism as is sometimes supposed. This becomes even more apparent when we examine the doctrine of sin in the Apocalypse, and the related doctrine of salvation by faith and works."[2] Further, IV Ezra held that the Law was powerless to resist the evil yezer.[3] This author rests all on the Grace of God rather than on the awards of the Law.

We conclude, then, that merit did not and could not create the inwardness of the spiritual experience we have reviewed above. Behind the practice of the Torah and Mitzwoth,[4] and the Jewish Doctrine of Merit, was the consciousness of Jahweh's Grace, which flowed to the worshippers through divinely appointed channels.

This conclusion is strengthened by direct testimony in Jewish literature regarding the Grace of God. The Sovereignty of God is always assumed; He can reward the poor and the faithful in the day of death.[5] He is mighty to forgive.[6] God has mercy on all flesh.[7] The Grace of God predominates according to His abundant *hesedh*. The salvation of Israel is from God; His arm had saved from spear and famine and pestilence; His Grace has kept the soul from declension and

[1] IV Esdras 7. 132–140. [2] Box, *Commentary IV Ezra*, 555.
[3] 3. 22. [4] 'Commandments.'
[5] B. Sira 11. 26. [6] 16. 11; cf. Ps. 86. 5. [7] B. Sira 18. 13 f.

death, and saved it from temptation.[1] The parsimony of man is compared with Jahweh's bounteous and plenteous *hesedh*.[2] After Pompey's entrance into Jerusalem, and owing to the straits of the pious, Jahweh is implored to gather the dispersed of Israel in Grace and kindness. There is no hope but in the covenant and the *name* of Jahweh ;[3] His Grace is upon those that have sinned and repented ; while the theme of Psalm 11 is the Sovereignty of God and the doings of His Grace.

The Author of the Assumption of Moses states the Doctrine of Grace in the terms of divine election and disclaims any merit in himself ; " not for any strength of mine, but of His good pleasure, have His compassion and long suffering fallen to my lot."[4]

When the above evidence is weighed we have reasons for pause before making sweeping generalisations on the Jewish Doctrine of Merit. At first sight, the passages which set forth the Grace of God would seem to contradict the evidence which has been adduced for the Doctrine of Merit. The truth is, however, that both views were held, side by side, and it never appeared to the Jewish mind that there was any discrepancy between them. If official Legalism hardened at length into the unscrupulous opposition of scribes and Pharisees to our Lord, the above quoted views on the inward importance of spiritual experience cannot be explained, except on the ground that the pious recognized the Torah as God's way of reconciling the unintentional sinner to Himself through His divinely appointed means of Grace. For " the consciousness of sin and the assurance of Grace are the two great motive powers in the working of religion. Without them religion sinks to the level of a mere cult . . . under these two realities—the reality of sin and the reality of Grace —the saint is constantly labouring ." [5] It was so in Judaism.

[1] Pss. of Sol. 16. 3 ; 16. 7–10. [2] 5. 15 f.
[3] 7. 6 f. ; cf. 9. 17 f.
[4] Ass. Moses 12. 7 f., 31. See Charles *in loco*.
[5] Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, 2nd Series, 178 f. See the whole chapter on " Jewish Saints and Saintliness."

We must keep before our mind, however, that it was the saint alone (the chasid) who enjoyed the experience of Jahweh's sustaining and assisting covenant-Grace. To the intentional sinner Grace never reached.

Hence, it is not as paradoxical as it sounds to say that a state of Grace was considered as the essential presupposition of the efficacy of good works.[1] The aim of the Jewish Church was to foster and conserve the consciousness of divine Grace as the central fact of the covenant, and as only available for the pious member. In doing so, the Doctrine of Grace as static, or regulative, *not dynamic or free*, was developed. Both within and without the nation, the pressure of circumstances was such that the Church felt compelled to build against those who denied the divine authorship and authority of the Torah ; in doing so, the Church built herself within her own walls, and developed an exclusive, deterministic Doctrine of Grace.

B. Jewish Apocalyptic Literature

It still remains to inquire into the Doctrine of Grace underlying Jewish apocalyptic theology. Fourth Ezra and other works shew the apocalyptist's despair of the Torah as an instrument to accomplish Israel's redemption. There is an aspect of Grace in these writings which needs setting forth, with a view to later comparison with the apocalyptic element in the Synoptic gospels. At this point, however, a word is necessary on the basis of the Old Testament Doctrine of Immortality.

Several centuries before any doctrine of a future life was hinted at in the Old Testament it was the common possession of other races. Egypt and India had reached very definite views on immortality, and Greece was far on the way to her final conclusions before the Old Testament wrestled with the problem. " For the most part the writers of the Old Testa-

[1] cf. Ps. 62. 12.

ment display toward the future of the individual beyond the grave a steady indifference; which is the more striking that it persists among lavish and brilliant hopes for the earthly future of the nation. The references to a personal immortality in the presence of God are exceptional." [1] There would be nothing remarkable in this attitude to the future did it not break with all we know of the evolution of the doctrine of immortality elsewhere. The place of ancestor worship in the development of this doctrine was always important to other races, but the cult of the ancestor among the Hebrews would have compromised the worship of Jahweh and it was therefore forbidden. While, elsewhere, the human spirit was restless in its search of some theory of the future life, the Hebrew was content with the assurance of God in the present world. The difference pointed out is that between the speculative and the religious temperament; it is the difference between religion as man's quest for God and religion conceived as God's quest for man.

Primitive ideas of a future life were no more than the projection of the conditions of present existence.[2] When it became necessary to discuss the 'place' where such life was to be spent, the speculative mind found abundant scope for its powers. Later, when the fact of retribution was fairly faced it led to considerable readjustment concerning 'how' and 'where' the future life was to be passed; [3] that is, an advancing knowledge of cause and effect had its influence on the relation of the present to the future. Early science found itself most deeply involved in matters concerning the future world. In Egypt it led to the doctrine of the future bliss of the good, who passed at death to the happy fields of Aalu; while the wicked were condemned to a cycle of reincarnations: the latter were doomed to travel the whole cycle of existence until the human form was once more reached, when a second opportunity was given them to escape.

[1] G. A. Smith, *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of O.T.*, 177.
[2] Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 75 f.
[3] Jevons, *Intro. to Hist. of Religion*, 301.

Later the good man was given his choice between the fields of Aalu and union with Osiris, which was the mergence of his individuality in the divine essence.[1]

In India the fact of retribution led to the reincarnation of good and evil alike ; there was no cycle and no escape from endless transmigration of the soul.[2] Gautama revolted against this theory most effectually by affirming that there was no soul to become reincarnate.[3]

In the sixth century B.C. Pythagoras introduced Egyptian views of the future life into Greece. Then Pindar transferred the bliss of Aalu to the Elysian plains.[4] This view of the future abode, and its happiness, was a great advance on the Greek Hades, the gloomy underground world of the dead. The Mysteries of the sixth century B.C., especially the Eleusinian Mysteries, where for the first time in history membership in a religious society was thrown open to all classes—slaves, women, and strangers—claimed to give to every *muētēs* security for the future. Initiation into the Mysteries was regarded as a passport to future bliss.[5] Thus far had Greece advanced ere the Jews had emerged from the Babylonian captivity.

Now, if the theory of retribution and reward led to such speculation on the future amongst the above-named peoples, why should it have raised no such problems among the Hebrews ? The view of retribution in the Old Testament was more moral than elsewhere ; but it was conceived as operating only upon the present earth. It is true that in the Old Testament retribution found no theory of the future life on which to work ; but the moral character of divine judgment, growing more ethical in its progress from Amos to Jeremiah, never

[1] Jevons, *ibid.*, 311. [2] Jevons, 317 f.

[3] Hackmann, *Buddhism as a Religion*, 11, 12.

[4] Adam, *Religious Teachers of Greece*, 133. Of the three leading ideas of Pindar's eschatology, " the first is metempsychosis, or rather, let us say, rebirth; the second, retribution and reward; and the third would seem to be the prospect of ultimate deliverance from the circle of incarnation by removal to the islands of the blest."

[5] Adam, p. 83. Also Jevons, chaps. 23, 24.

once raises the problem of the future of the individual. Sheol remains "the land where all things are forgotten." [1]

We must seek the explanation of the facts stated above in the basis of the Old Testament theory of retribution. The Hebrew stood apart in that his estimate of retribution was the resultant of his grasp of the divine purpose in history. He had no theory of punishment which did not arise out of his Doctrine of Grace—the essential *differentia* of his religion when compared with others. It was an experience of the unearned goodness of God which shaped his views on judgment. Herein lay the contrast between speculation and inspired religious experience. From the revelation at Sinai, the Hebrew interpreted his own history as the unfolding of Jahweh's gracious purpose. From the first, however, it was realized that certain subjective conditions in the nation must result in Jahweh's Grace passing over into judgment; "see, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil." [2] It is this truth which makes the eighth-century prophets with all their evangelical fervour the greatest preachers of doom in the Old Testament. It is our immediate task, however, to understand the 'place' where Jahweh's purpose was conceived as operating. The 'Day of the Lord' would bring chastisement to the chosen race *upon this earth;* still, this 'Day of the Lord,' with all its terrors for the wicked, would see the triumph of Jahweh's purpose in history; it would be the occasion when the Remnant was established by Grace *upon this earth.* As long as the Old Testament conceived religious experience in the terms of the nation, this earth was regarded as the sphere for the manifestation of final Grace and consequently judgment.

When Jeremiah proclaimed the spiritual relation of the individual to Jahweh, several centuries passed away before its significance for the future life was worked out. At length, the intensity of the individual's present spiritual experience

[1] Ps. 6. 5; 88. 10–12; Eccles. 9. 10.
[2] Deut. 30. 15–20.

led to a revolt against the theory that death and Sheol could close it. If Jahweh were eternal and omnipotent (and through communion with Him in the present world, the individual came to believe that He was), then it belonged to Jahweh to redeem the soul of His beloved from Sheol.[1] Hence, to taste the Grace of Jahweh in this life became the earnest of a continuing fellowship with fulness of joy and eternal pleasures at God's right hand. The earliest views of the future life in Israel were thus rooted in the individual's experience of divine Grace in the present.

Had Jewish Theology continued to evolve the new religious values as taught by Jeremiah, Deutero-Isaiah, and Job, that is, along spiritual and ethical lines, Jewish apocalyptic would have become far less narrow and deterministic than it actually did. The eighth-century prophets are held in wonder before the widening horizon of their historical outlook and the promising scope of Jahweh's transcendent purpose; they have a vision of all nations flowing into the house of the Lord.[2] Later, Jeremiah proclaimed the new covenant, inward and written on the heart. The devotional literature of the Psalter reveals the magnificence of divine Grace as it was experienced in public worship. Job, out of suffering in which Jahweh's motive is justified, hurls back the traditional view of retribution. This promise of progress makes it clear that a deepening spiritual experience was leading Israel beyond the perils of a religious particularism; if this stream of religious life had run its course it must have led to the view that man as man had a spiritual value to God; inspired by such an estimate of human nature the Jewish Church must have attempted the programme for the race which the Suffering Servant carried through for the nation: most of all, Israel must have preached to the great heathen world the splendour and richness of Jahweh's Grace as it is revealed in the Book of Jonah.

Now the doctrine of a future life, or permanent security for the pious individual, had no sooner won a place in Jewish

[1] Ps. 16. 8–11; 3. 5. [2] Isa. 2. 2.

Theology than it reacted on the method of establishing the Messianic kingdom. The future life and bliss of the righteous were to be consummated when the Theocracy was completely realized.[1] *For the pious individual the fulfilment of this hope was all that was understood by the promise of future life.* His future bliss and the Messianic hope must interpret each other. And what we find is this : the Jewish Church used the doctrine of the future life of the individual to sharpen the particularistic views of Israel's place in history. This comes out clearly in the Jewish Apocalypses.

When the nation was at peace the theocratic problem receded into the background. During the temporary success of the Maccabees hope of the Messianic king and kingdom died down. Jonathan was even accepted as God's anointed. The writer of I Enoch ch. 85–90 regards the Theocracy as bound up with the successors of the Maccabean leaders. Before John Hyrcanus broke with the Pharisees—a period of prosperity—he received the Messianic titles of Prophet, Priest and King. During these intervals of well-being, Israel's pressure towards the future relaxed ; but it was otherwise in times of national distress and persecution : then an apocalypse would appear ringing out some message of hope ; at once, the national consciousness would begin to surge, Messianic ideas would be revived, and the Jewish Church would begin to cry for the direct intervention of the Most High, who had made two worlds not one.

In this present world, it was felt that Israel's ascendancy had been long deferred and was long overdue. After centuries of suffering, Ezekiel's promise of the restoration of Israel, mistress within her own borders, was still unfulfilled. Disaster had followed disaster with the briefest respite under the Maccabees. How could such intolerable humiliations be reconciled with Jahweh's covenant-promise ? Out of such desperate circumstances, partly as a revolt against pessimism,

[1] On such questions as whether the Resurrection was limited to the pious, or to the nation, or extended to include the race, reference must be made to the Jewish sources themselves. There is no consistent theory, one view being put forth here and another there.

the apocalyptists arrived at one definite conclusion; no ordinary method would suffice to give effect to the covenant. Hence, with astonishing vehemence, they appealed from earth to heaven, from the insolence of Antiochus Epiphanes and Pompey to the omnipotence of Jahweh: in doing so, these writers advance the most remarkable views on divine transcendence to be found in religious literature, often pushing the Doctrine of the Sovereignty of God far beyond the ethical implications of the covenant.

This will be clear as we recall the salient facts in Jewish apocalyptic literature. These writings, in the most vivid language, present the Jewish views on Grace and Judgment by crisis, as the two sides of the irresistible purpose of Jahweh. Again we point out that both conceptions are unique in the history of religion, and that both are the result of interpreting history in the terms of the divine purpose. Some acquaintance with these views is vital to any understanding, such as we seek, of our Lord's teaching on eschatology.

1. Jewish apocalyptic concludes that the human race has become unmanageable. This world is no longer meal which Judaism can leaven; it is no longer a field to be sown with the righteousness of Jahweh; it is stubble to be consumed. Nothing less than the drastic close of the present world-order will do. We are now confronted, says Charles, with a *Determinism* which predestined Israel to life and the heathen world to death.

2. By what method or agency was the divine purpose to be realized? Sometimes by direct cataclysmic action on the part of God Himself. This view is expressed in those books which recognize no intermediate Messianic agency. The author of the *Assumption of Moses*, a Pharisaic quietist, whose silences rebuke the political aspirations of the Pharisees, looks to direct action by God to establish the Theocracy, when Israel has repented for one day.[1] The Salathiel apocalypse, discarding the old eschatology of the nation, expects an immediate act of God to end this present world-order.[2]

[1] 1. 17 f.; cf. 10. 8. [2] IV Ezra 10. 25

It was more usual, however, to introduce a personal Messiah as meditating the divine purpose and finally effecting Jahweh's Grace. I Enoch is specially fertile in Messianic titles and functions. In the Parables ch. 37–71, the term Messiah is applied for the first time in Jewish literature to the ideal king who was to come; he is the Righteous One, the Elect One, and the Son of Man. In the Psalter of Solomon the Messiah is no more than a warrior who springs from the house of David.[1] In IV Ezra he dies as any other man who has done his work.[2]

Now, in what sense is the Messiah the bearer of the Grace of God? What is His attitude to sinners? We notice first his relation to the intentional sinners within Israel. As a warning to this class, I Enoch vividly describes the agony of the watchers, spiritual beings, who through sexual lust begat a race of giants, who in turn became demons and impelled men to sin against God. He sees them seeking for mercy with tears; but he learns that though they pray to eternity they shall neither obtain peace nor forgiveness—*aphesis*.[3] The impious Israelites who have not kept the law nor the commandments shall endure an eternal curse;[4] they shall never obtain mercy.[5] The apostate Sadducees are to be covered with imprecations which remind us of the vindictive Psalms.[6] Numerous similar passages are found in other works. *Hence, the coming of the Messiah as the bearer of the Grace of God holds out no gleam of hope, no promise of mercy, to the sinners within Israel.*

What is the attitude of the Messiah to the Gentiles? We are not unmindful of the tinges of universalism in the Testaments and elsewhere.[7] Such passages, however, are too few to neutralize the main trend of Jewish apocalyptic, which holds out no hope whatever to the Gentiles. When the Grace of Jahweh is finally manifested in the founding of the Theo-

[1] 17. 23–25, 36; 18. 6–8.
[2] 7. 29 f.
[3] I Enoch 12. 5–6; chaps. 13–14.
[4] 5. 4.
[5] 5. 5.
[6] I Enoch chs. 91–104; Pss. of Sol. 4. 16–25.
[7] I Enoch 48. 8, where the Son of Man is a light to the Gentiles.

cracy, the Gentiles shall be judged. The righteous, upon whom divine Grace has descended, even cry for vengeance upon the wicked.[1] The judgment and punishment of the Gentiles are vested in the hands of the pious.[2] The righteous execute judgment on the sinners according to their desires.[3] Sheol shall devour sinners in the presence of the elect people.[4] The angels of heaven rejoice over the destruction of the Gentiles ;[5] such as they cannot hope to live for they know no ransom.[6] The Son of Man shall break the teeth of sinners because they refuse to extol Him ; by the word of His mouth He slays them. The Gentiles are to be annihilated.[7] God hates sinners and rejoices over their destruction.[8] The crowning passage tells of the joy of the angels because the sword of the Messiah is drunk with the blood of Gentiles ;[9] as a warrior He slays the heathen with His own hand.[10] *Thus, the coming of the Messiah as the bearer of divine Grace issues in no appeal to the Gentiles. No opportunity is given to sinners to repent, and repentance would be of no avail were there an opportunity.*

Judaism, therefore, relies on a final manifestation of the Grace of God, some cataclysmic act, by which the Theocracy shall be consummated : this divine intervention will also be accompanied by an act of Judgment when Jewish apostates and Gentiles shall be destroyed. Grace and Judgment by crisis are thus seen as the two sides of Jahweh's purpose. Now this should lead us to see that eschatology is not the key to Judaism. By far the most mighty element in Jewish apocalyptic is its Doctrine of God. We must look to the Doctrine of Divine Transcendence to explain this manifestation of Grace by catastrophe.

The error of the Jewish Church lay in its rigid, deterministic views of God and history. There is a divine motive in history, but it has belied the expectations of Jewish apocalyptic.

[1] I Enoch 22. 5–7. [2] 91. 12. [3] 95. 3.
[4] 56. 8. [5] 97. 2 ; cf. Luke 15. 10.
[6] 98. 10 f. [7] Ass. Moses, ch. 10.
[8] B. Sira 12. 6 ; I Enoch 94. 10. [9] Enoch 62. 11.
[10] Apoc., Baruch 72. 4–6 ; ch. 82 ; IV Ezra 12. 32.

(It has persisted until the present day as the inspiration of all Christian character and effort.) God did not, however, hurl the world to destruction to save the Jewish Church ; in other words, Grace is never arbitrary ; it is never mere favour : it is the goodness of God entering the heart and bearing its own categorical imperative within itself.

It follows, therefore, that Judaism is an evolution of religion which is not progress ; its doctrines of God, Man, and their relation are not in the true line of development with the Old Testament. This literature, estimated from the standpoint of the evolution of religion in Israel, reveals a movement which ebbs rather than flows. The doctrine of the future life, rich with promise in the Psalter and Job, is made to serve the exclusive ambitions of the Jewish Church. It was in the face of this decadent religious life that our Lord was compelled to seek a historical setting for His own ideas. He had to express much of His truth in its forms of thought ; especially must this fact be remembered when dealing with synoptic eschatology. But our Lord is in the direct line of development with the prophets and the Psalter and Job, not with extra-Jewish literature ; such literature was the product of a degenerating religious experience : He repudiated its doctrines of God and man and their relation, and therefore the deterministic basis on which its Doctrine of Grace rested.

BOOK ONE

THE GRACE OF GOD, OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE, IN THE PERSONALITY OF JESUS

CHAPTER I

THE GRACE OF GOD PROMPTING HIS ACTION IN JESUS

A. The Birth Narrative

1. *Critical Results*

THE critical questions which arise in connection with the birth stories are mostly related to the supernatural element, and therefore to the doctrine of Grace which they contain. The attempt to shew that Luke 1. 34 f. is an interpolation in the original narrative has failed.[1] Whether Mary, Elizabeth, or the evangelist composed the Magnificat does not affect its spiritual value. The result of searching criticism has been to establish the Palestinian origin and character of the narratives. The Lucan chapters name several authors, and the inference is, that the evangelist finally edited material which was already well known in certain Palestinian circles. The use of prophecy in the First gospel is no longer a menace to the truth of its birth story. In face of the critical results which have been established concerning Matthew's use of Isaiah 7. 14, it cannot be said that the prophecy created the history. Neither Isaiah nor the exegetes of his Immanuel prophecy used the

[1] Box, *D.C.G.*, II, 806. Moffatt, *Intro. N.T. Lit.*, 267 ff. Sanday, *Recent Research*, 165 f.

term virgin, in the sense in which it is applied to Mary in the First gospel.[1] The virgin birth was not part of the Messianic hope. Neither the Old Testament nor Jewish literature regarded such an origin as central to the Messianic king or kingdom. The first evangelist writes as one who is conscious of stating a fact which would not commend itself to the popular mind of his day. His apologetic tone leads to the conviction that he knew the virgin birth would create more difficulties for the Jew than it would solve. The outcome of these critical questions is to establish a more serious claim than ever for the historicity of both narratives. The result has been to sharpen the reference in the original text to the virgin birth.[2]

2. *Luke's Gospel*

We consider the narrative in the Third gospel first, since it contains a fuller use of the terms significant for our study than is found elsewhere in the Synoptic gospels. *Charis* occurs eight times in Luke, and nowhere else in the first three gospels. In four cases it has the meaning of 'thanks'[3]—a purely Greek usage. Three of the remaining four instances are found in the birth narratives. The solitary use of *charis* as Grace, in relation to our Lord's ministry, occurs in the editor's comment on the effect produced by the sermon at Nazareth.[4] The connotation of *charis* in the birth stories is full of interest. The word is clearly passing through the transition period. It still expresses *hen* in the sense of favour, but it receives a deeper ethical tinge than it has in the Old Testament, due to the fact that divine favour is now related to the Messianic purpose. "Hail, thou that art endued with *charis*, the Lord is with thee."[5] . . . Thou hast found *charis* with God.[6] *Charis* is used in the Old Testament sense of finding favour, but it is clear that the word is used of Mary because of God's choice of her to effect His purpose. She

[1] G. B. Gray, *Expositor*, April, 1911.
[2] Moffatt, 251.
[3] Luke 6. 32, 33, 34; 17. 9.
[4] Luke 4. 22.
[5] 1. 28.
[6] 1. 30.

herself understood God's *charis* in relation to His Messianic purpose ; and such a connotation was a real advance on its meaning in the Old Testament. Mary's personal enjoyment of the divine favour was completely transcended in her exulting of the end for which it was bestowed : she received it as a means to the realization of the Divine Will in history.

' And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature and in *charis* with God and man.'[1] The meaning here is that of lovableness and acceptableness. As a boy, Jesus grew in that graciousness of manner and life which won the approval of God and man.

' And the Grace of God was upon Him.' [2] In this instance *charis* means that God's favour or loving-kindness, the central fact in the divine character, was upon Jesus. Taken in conjunction with the whole of the birth narrative in Luke, it states the climax of the history as far as it had been recorded. The Grace of God was over all the events of Jesus' birth and boyhood. All that *ḥesedh* meant to the Hebrew as he remembered the covenant, that, and more, does *charis* connote in relation to Jesus. In the Old Testament the covenant revealed the ultimate motive of God toward Israel ; and the Grace of God upon the boy Jesus must be understood in the light of the new covenant, and its blessing of the forgiveness of sins to the race.

In none of these instances does *charis* express the Pauline conception of Grace. It is difficult to see how Luke could have read Paulinism into the records of the historical ministry and left out the Apostle's use of *charis*. The Grace of God upon the persons in the birth narratives is not conceived as the antithesis of sin. It is very probable that Luke was not the author of *charis* in the birth narratives, but that he found the word in the Palestinian sources which he edited. He would, however, recognize that such a word was the only key to the history of the birth. He was also aware of the extraordinary claims which the nativity narrative would make on

[1] 2. 50. [2] 2. 40.

the faith of Gentile readers, and that nothing less than a grasp of the gracious and transcendent purpose, creating and controlling the history, would make it intelligible.

The Grace of God prompted His action also in the birth of the Forerunner. It led Him to answer the prayer of Zacharias ;[1] and to fill the child with Holy Spirit,[2] that he should serve the divine purpose.[3] John's birth, character, and all the service he shall render are seen as the resultant of God's Grace.[4] The Benedictus is a hymn to this Grace. It keeps close to the most spiritual Messianic outlook of the Old Testament. The horn of salvation is raised up from the house of David ; Israel's redemption is still associated with political emancipation ;[5] but the time has now arrived when God has manifested His *ḥesedh* towards the fathers, and remembered His holy covenant. The name of the Forerunner himself was significant of the divine favour which overruled his birth.[6] Elizabeth and her husband, their neighbours and kinsfolk, recognized that in the birth of John "the Lord has magnified His Grace."[7] The experiences in which they found themselves involved were due neither to themselves nor to any other human agency ; such experiences were initiated and controlled by God, who was preparing to give the knowledge of salvation unto the people in the remission of their sins.[8]

. Briggs declares that "the Annunciation represents the conception of Jesus as due to a theophany."[9] What concerns us most is the meaning of this theophany. It is unlike any that preceded it, by reason of marking the fulness of time for the manifestation of the divine purpose in human flesh. The overshadowing of the Most High is the final expression for divine agency in the conception of the Son of the Most High. Mary's son, it is said, shall be holy. This "involves the introduction of a new factor, to which the taint of sin does not attach. If like produces like, the element of unlikeness

[1] Luke 1. 13. [2] 1. 15. [3] 1. 16 f., 76. [4] 1. 78.
[5] 1. 71. [6] *Johanan* from *ḥanan* = to shew favour.
[7] 1. 58. [8] 1. 77. [9] *Messiah and the Gospels*, 50.

must come from that to which it has itself affinity."[1] Mary's reticence and reluctance are different from the unbelief of Zacharias. She responds to the divine control in such measure that concerning her, "from God, no word shall be impossible."

The Magnificat is the praise of a humble soul, full of quivering joy and apocalyptic expectation, that God who is mighty is also abundantly gracious, and hath chosen a handmaiden of low estate. The conception is interpreted through the profound consciousness of the covenant-relation between Jahweh and Israel. "He hath holpen Israel His servant that He might remember His compassions." "And His Grace is unto generations and generations on them that fear Him."

3. *Matthew's Gospel*

The account of the nativity in the First gospel agrees with Luke concerning divine agency in the birth of Mary's child. The first evangelist, unlike Luke, writes as an apologist. Whether Joseph had been the object of slander on account of the propagation of the birth story we do not know. At any rate, there is an attempt to vindicate Joseph, and explain to the Jewish reader at the same time Joseph's intense struggle and its issue, when he became conscious of Mary's condition. The whole argument of the writer assumes that the Jews were not expecting their Messiah to be born of a virgin. He recognizes the extraordinary nature of the claim of the virgin-birth on the faith of the Jewish people. If the Jews, however, felt the difficulty to be so acute, Joseph did not feel it less, but more. The evangelist is careful to point out that Joseph is a righteous man, a pious member of the Jewish Church, whose thoughts and actions commanded the utmost respect from the Jewish community. It is pointed out that to Joseph's conscience Mary's condition was a terrible problem; that after most strenuous wrestling with himself, in which he

[1] Sanday, *B. D.*, art. "Jesus Christ."

was minded to take the extreme measure of putting Mary away privily, he was finally assured that the child of Mary was central to the realization of the Messianic purpose of God. The experience of Mary, as revealed to us in the Annunciation and Magnificat, convinced Joseph that the child was due to unique divine mediation, and that through the child it was the gracious motive of God to save His people from their sins. If Joseph was so persuaded concerning the origin and purpose of Mary's condition, the first evangelist appeals to the Jewish Church—not, like Joseph, personally involved—to accept his statement. Moreover, Joseph was a son of David, and there was nothing incompatible with Jewish belief that the covenant was to be consummated in Joseph's legal son. In the fullest possible way the evangelist identifies the Messianic expectation, which was all of the Grace of God, with the birth of Jesus.

4. *The Birth a Revelation of Divine Grace*

All those who come into contact with, or have any concern with, the birth and early years of Jesus described their experience as due to divine Grace. The shepherds, objects of the Shekinah, are themselves the recipients of good-tidings of great joy. They hear the good news of a *Saviour* who is the Lord's anointed ; and the good pleasure of God toward men on the earth is revealed to them. Simeon, 'righteous and devout,' keeping vigil for the ultimate manifestation of God's loving-kindness, sees the salvation of the Lord in Jesus. He was conscious of the fulness of the Grace of God upon Him, for in Him he saw a light for the illumination of the Gentiles, and the glory of the people Israel. Anna spake of Jesus to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem. Luke crowns these experiences by saying that the Grace of God was upon Jesus.

The First gospel, having explained the attitude of Joseph to Mary, proceeds to point out to Jewish readers the homage of the Gentile world to the Messiah, even at His birth. The

coming of the wise men was due to a divine manifestation in the heavens ; by direct revelation they were led to worship Jesus as the Messiah, and offer to Him the tribute and wealth of the Gentile peoples. The distress of Herod at His birth would be welcome news : his nervous schemes, his quest for the young child, his defeat at the hands of the Magi would add weight to the Messianic claims of Jesus. The narrative makes it clear that Herod was fighting against God, but was unable to thwart the Messianic purpose. When the life of the child was in peril, and the powers of Herod conspired to slay Him, the Grace of God under the aspect of a purposeful Providence intervened, until the death of those who sought the young child's life.

The purpose of the genealogies in the First and Third gospels is to shew that Joseph was of Davidic descent, and that Jesus was Joseph's legal son. From the time of the eighth-century prophets the splendour of David's reign had furnished materials for the doctrine of the Messianic king and kingdom. To shew that Jesus had legal descent from David was to claim that the possibility of His Messiahship was not excluded. This is the motive of the genealogies. The Jews would see in these genealogies the Grace of God, flowing down from Abraham, or Adam, to their own day. The first evangelist asks the Jews to pause, for the stream of Grace has now become an ocean. The ' Fathers ' used to see, in the remarkable insertion of the names of four women in Matthew's list, the sap of the genealogical tree : such names proclaimed the magnificence of divine grace to the morally abandoned. The same truth was observed in the omission of the three Kings, Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah, men branded with ' theocratic illegality.'

It is seen, then, that the birth stories describe a series of events as due to the initiative of a Being altogether supernatural. They also present these events as occurri g within the realm of divine ends. The history of each person sets forth the objective manifestation of God's loving-kindness

with a view to redeeming His own people and the Gentiles. God's will is embodied in His Son ; and the Power which initiates and controls the events narrated is transcendent and immanent. These records may be challenged in the name of physics or philosophy ; but, confessedly, they deal with that which is *meta*-physical. Science has sifted the narratives, and they still remain a unity. No further can science go. The Comparative Method of studying Religion has furnished no convincing parallels to these synoptic accounts.[1] Pantheism, full blown in Spinoza, or incipient as in Edward Caird, denies the historicity and the possibility of the Incarnation as taught in these narratives. All such arguments, however, are broken upon the reality and strength of the ultimate and gracious purpose of God, who inspires the experience under consideration. It seems impossible to account for these narratives on any natural basis of explanation ; and they make a claim which has been verified in the Christian consciousness of succeeding generations that God willed to save men from their sin in Jesus Christ.

B. The Baptism

In the baptism, the First and Third gospels continue the history of the Grace of God, prompting His action upon and in Jesus. The manifestation of divine Grace to Jesus in baptism is obviously, in the view of the Third gospel, a continuity of the experience of His boyhood when the Grace of God was upon Him. The introduction of Jesus by Mark is very abrupt : " Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptised of John in the Jordan." If Mark wrote before 50 A.D. the birth accounts may have been unknown to him, for the humility and winsome reserve of the documents are evidence that neither on the occasion of the birth nor afterwards would the facts be ' noised abroad.' Mark's omission of the

[1] See appendix, *Person of Jesus Christ*, by H. R. Mackintosh, 2nd edition. Also *Orr. Virgin Birth*, ch. vi.

birth stories has led to theories of our Lord's Person which are equally abrupt as the evangelist's introduction. One of them is to regard the baptism as the occasion when Jesus *first* realized Himself as the Messiah. There are two answers to this suggestion ; first, it is unsound psychology to assume that Jesus was not, or could not be, conscious of His vocation until the moment that He entered upon it ; secondly, a study of the Synoptic gospels shews that our Lord was not primarily concerned with official and legal Jewish titles. His consciousness was that of a Son who knew the Father, and in His filial consciousness, of all strands of thought which were woven into the Messianic ideal, that of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah was the most pronounced. It is true that the voice at the baptism confirmed Jesus as the Messianic King, but it also confirmed Him as the Suffering Servant.[1] There are great difficulties in regarding the baptism as an alternative explanation of the Person of Jesus to that given in the birth stories ; as a remarkable theophany which led Jesus into His earliest consciousness of Messiahship. Matthew and Luke[2] intend us to see the baptism as a continuity of the Grace which was upon Jesus from the beginning.

The first occasion when we learn anything of the consciousness of Jesus is during His visit to the Temple : " Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house ? " These words imply that even then Jesus was conscious of His Father's constraint. As a Son of the Law, and through His own subjective experience of divine Grace, He was growing in the perception of that objective righteousness, which He was increasingly conscious later on of embodying in Himself. We must allow for the educational influence of the mind of Mary, of His home, and of Old Testament scripture, in all this early development. To Jesus the Law and the Prophets were ever sacramental and inspirational to His fulfilling of them both. When we add to such sacramental experiences the freedom of unique direct contact and communion with His

[1] Ps. 2. 7=Mc. 1. 11a ; Isa. 42. 1=Mc. 1. 11b.
[2] On the alternative reading of Luke 3. 22 ; cf. Moffatt, *I.N.T.,L.* p. 269.

Father, we can better understand His remarkable consciousness of divine compulsion, revealed in His request for baptism. To rule out Matthew 3. 14 f., on the ground that it is a late attempt by the congregation to explain the difficulty which was felt concerning the baptism of the Son of God, is surely unnecessary. The request of Jesus for baptism crystallizes His growing consciousness of what was involved for Him in the fulfilling of all righteousness or, which means the same thing, the fulfilling of the redemptive will of the Father. It means that the Grace of His Father had led Him to the decisive act of fulfilling the Law and the Prophets. "For thus," He persuaded John, "it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." That this was the meaning of His act is confirmed by the voice from heaven which identified Jesus with the Servant of Jahweh; and there is nothing in Matthew 3. 14 f. which cannot be explained through this consciousness. As the Grace of God operated through the Servant to redeem the nation, so the Grace of the Father was operating through Jesus' motive and action to identify Himself with those whom He had come to redeem. In requesting baptism, Jesus shewed that He conceived it as part of His vocation at that period of His life, as fulfilling the complete conditions of salvation, that He should be numbered with the transgressors who were baptised by John.

Luke draws attention to another subjective aspect of our Lord's baptismal experience. He says that Jesus, having been baptised and *praying*, the heaven was opened. Bengel says the voice was an answer to prayer. That Christ's motive for baptism was one with the divine purpose to redeem the race is abundantly clear from the fulness of the manifestation of Grace in the event. Whether the descent of the Spirit, and the voice from heaven were for Jesus alone, as Mark suggests, or for the bystanders, it was an objective manifestation of God's good pleasure upon Him. Luke emphasizes the objectivity of the Spirit's descent by saying that He came down in bodily form, as a dove, upon Him.

It was the grace of God which prompted the bestowal of

power upon Christ at the baptism. Our Lord absorbed this power of the Spirit until, in the unity of His own Personality, the Grace of God became objective to others. How it gave illumination and direction to His own thought ; how it moved his emotional life ; how it urged His will, a complete study of the gospels can alone reveal. The gift of the Holy Spirit brought to Him a quickened consciousness of power to be and to do ; in other words, the objective aspect of the baptism must never be divorced from its subjective aspect. It was an experience in which Jesus was conscious of a sudden access of spiritual power, in which He realized that His hour had come to enter upon His public work.

C. The Temptation

As the descent of the Holy Spirit at the baptism sets forth the objective nature of divine Grace upon Jesus, the temptation narrative furnishes a study in its subjective aspect. Luke says that Jesus " being full of the Holy Spirit," was tempted of the devil. In other words, our Lord received an endowment of Grace before the temptation. As far as we are able to explain the subjective experience of Jesus in face of these temptings, we must do so in relation to His consciousness of possessing this Grace. It is also well to remember that Jesus, and not another, was interpreting His experience in these verses ; that is, we are dealing with our Lord's own account of the reality of His freedom and the issues which hung upon His decisions. In all three temptations evil attacks the will of Jesus. Each assault is directed toward a different side of His Personality and varies with the pressure of circumstances ; but each onset is an inducement to the will of Jesus to revolt against His Father's will and way. Now when we speak of the Father's Grace as objective to Jesus, we mean that the Father's redemptive will was objective to Him, and the central appeal of the Father's Grace or

redemptive will was made to the will of Jesus. When our Lord was filled with the Holy Spirit it means that there was an interaction between the Father's will and His own which knew no friction. This condition or interaction of wills was an activity in which Jesus transmuted divine Grace for the doing of the Father's will into obedience. Jesus had fulfilled all righteousness in His baptism, and in His temptation He still continues to meet the ethical demands of the Father's Grace. What it cost Him to do so He reveals in these verses. He describes the struggle through which He passed in order to accomplish God's purpose of overcoming evil. He relates how He was tempted to act in ways which were inconsistent with His Father's way. To have done so, as He implied, would have been to surrender to the devil. That is, if Jesus had used His power for any other than ethical ends He would have lost it.

The first attack on the will of Jesus is made through His conditions of physical distress. He was hungry. He met the attack successfully, because His will was inspired by the gracious resources of His Father. "Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." We are helped to understand how he encountered this attack of evil by His words on another occasion: "My meat and drink is to do the will of Him that sent Me." In surrendering Himself to the objective control of the Father's will He was nourished by resources which enabled Him to transcend the temporary needs of the body. This answer shews our Lord's confidence in earthly good as second to, and guaranteed by, the doing of the Father's will. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

The second temptation is obviously an attack on Jesus' professed trust in God. Psalm 91. gives objective to the Tempter's thrust. "He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty." Only as the Most High is a man's habitation shall no evil befall him. Our Lord's trust in the Father was the very

antithesis of tempting Him. True trust never presumes on its object. Any physical risks which are incurred in the loyalty of the will to God are estimated at their true worth as we shall see later in the experience of Jesus Himself. "If thou be the Son of God," insinuated the Tempter, "cast thyself down from hence," assuming that the Messiah should be immune from all physical perils. Again, the struggle centres in our Lord's will, but He still trusts in God and thereby shews that He has chosen His Father's will; for to trust in God and choose self-will was impossible. Not thus was the divine shadow enjoyed; "thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

The third attack follows on Jesus' choice of the Father's will. The Tempter sees how resolute that choice is and now proceeds to suggest that God's will may be done in other than God's way. It seems clear that this is an attempt to induce Jesus to abandon His conception of Himself as the Suffering Servant. It shews how deeply rooted His conviction was, long before the incident at Cæsarea Philippi, that in responding to the demands of the Father's redemptive will, He was called to travel the path of suffering love. Our Lord's discernment between the worship of Satan and the worship of the Father should be noted in this connexion. In the former case it coincided with an act of self-will. Jesus, however, chooses the Father's way and wills to do His service, even as the Suffering Servant. "Him only," says Jesus, "shalt thou serve." Finding the will of Jesus invulnerable, "then the devil leaveth Him."

The above attacks on our Lord's will reveal the permanent elements in His temptations. Christ is not merely describing a single act, or series of acts, but rather the constant assailing of His will by evil as He served His Father. The further study of His subjective experience will make this truth more manifest. On one occasion He speaks to the disciples of "my temptations," and in the present instance He means them to understand how He resisted and overcame the permanent seductions of human life.

It is probable that Jewish conceptions in the time of

Jesus may have given temporary form to these three temptations. The Tempter presents the same views of divine agency which we find in Jewish apocalyptic literature: the same unethical theories of divine power found in that literature are often voiced in the gospels. The first temptation is elucidated by our Lord's attitude to the multitude that followed Him as long as they ate of the loaves and were filled: when He refused to feed them further, "many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him."[1] Did there come to Jesus in that hour a subtle temptation to satisfy the popular demand for bread? Or after the day's ministry of healing in Capernaum was He concerned about the further effect of His miraculous powers on the popular mind? For it was then that He rose up early and went out to pray. Further, we know the persistence of the Jewish request for a sign from heaven, and our Lord's refusal to grant it. The demand for a sign would present itself to His mind as a negation of trust in the Father's will. In the case of the third attack, when all the kingdoms of the world were shewn to Him in a moment of time, we have the Jewish apocalyptic view of the cataclysmic coming of the kingdom. As was pointed out in the Introduction, it was expected by the Jews that the Messianic kingdom would be founded in a blaze of apocalyptic glory. Our Lord's startling and scathing verdict on these views is seen in His denunciation of them as temptations of the devil. As John the Baptist had pointed out, if the power of God were as arbitrary as they thought, it could be used against them as well as for them. It would be as easy and as moral to raise up children of Abraham from the stones as to order history for their sakes. Our Lord's resistance to this attack should lead us to see the ethical values which He put upon Jewish apocalyptic hopes in contrast with His own way as the Suffering Servant.

Now the temptation narrative has profound importance for the ideal Christian Ethic as revealed in the experience of the Master under the historic conditions of the ministry. It shews clearly what direction the will of the disciple should

[1] John 6. 66.

take against those attacks of evil which constantly assail him. It shews how One who is full of the Holy Spirit acts, whatever the pressure of circumstances; that He acts not on the principle of self-will, but in obedience to the will of His Father. Jesus explains that He resisted every appeal to act independently of God's will. It involved Him in loneliness and in conflict to respond continually to the Father's objective Grace, but in the interaction of the Father's will and His own, the infinite resources of Grace became accessible to Him. Thus early in His career Jesus begins to present in His Personality the objective and subjective aspects of redeeming Grace.

D. The Sermon at Nazareth

Luke 4. 16–34

Between the baptism and the sermon at Nazareth sufficient time had elapsed for a remarkable exercise of our Lord's preaching and healing powers. The sermon presupposes a period in which Jesus had made use of His endowment of divine Grace for the good of men. The discourse in the synagogue is of value, therefore, at this point of our enquiry, for the further light it throws on our Lord's consciousness of the objective Grace of His Father. He says that He has been anointed to fulfil the redemptive will of God by preaching the gospel and healing the sick. The people were already conscious of a new note of authority in His preaching, and of His miraculous powers. He wishes them to understand, however, that He has been uniquely anointed by the Father for the work that He has done, and is to do: "the spirit of the Lord is upon Me." No explanation, other than that of the Father's anointing, can interpret Himself and His words and works. Pfleiderer thinks that when Jesus saw the oppression of the people He "felt that the prophetic spirit had taken hold of Him," and that "the

distress of the people became His call." [1] This explanation is altogether too subjective. It leaves no room for that objective reality which was uppermost in the consciousness of Jesus Himself. We have words from His own lips to the effect that He was conscious of the Father's objective control in what He said and did. Jesus allows no possibility for any purely subjective explanation of His life and work. While it is true that He was touched with infinite compassion for the poor there is no suggestion that their economic condition evoked His consciousness of being anointed to preach to them. This view would interpret Jesus in the terms of a Reformer. We must not, however, reverse the psychological processes of our Lord's growing consciousness ; and His words on this occasion carry us much further back than the idea of Reformer. At His baptism and onwards He was conscious of being endowed with resources of divine Grace such as could only belong to an Originator of new redemptive experience. The people themselves had recognized the manifestation of this Grace in His Galilean ministry, and as He now draws their attention to its source in Himself, they wonder, says Calvin, at " His discourses of Grace." Later, we shall consider in detail the contents of our Lord's message of Grace in His preaching and healing.

It is impossible to abstract the objective from the subjective aspects of our Lord's consciousness as set forth in the sermon at Nazareth. Already His will had been tested in Galilee, for He had known the disappointment of rejection at Capernaum. He was to be tried again, for His sermon was to end with His rejection at Nazareth. Thus did the element of conflict become real, ere He had fully made known His motives ; and every refusal of His message made His response to the Grace of the Father a greater effort of will. It is worthy of note that Jesus suggested that the scope of His mission was wider than national. Just as Elijah was sent to the widow of Sarepta, and Naaman the Syrian received healing at the direction of Elisha, so He was anointed to

[1] *Christian Origins*, 86 f.

preach the acceptable year of the Lord, or the new dispensation of Grace, to all who were willing to receive it. This suggestion of the universal scope of our Lord's programme would be readily recorded by Luke.

E. The Father's Unique Committal

Matthew 11. 27 ; *Luke* 10. 22

Nowhere in the Synoptic gospels is our Lord's judgment concerning His relation to the Father more weighty and explicit than it is in this logion. It is "the greatest Christological passage in the New Testament, the climax of Jesus' witness to Himself."[1] Jesus claims that "the secret of His own nature is hidden with God, as the secret of God's nature is given to Him alone to reveal."[2] There is nothing in the Christological view of the Fourth gospel which is not contained in this synoptic passage ; and neither literary nor historical criticism has been able to shake its witness. This verse is in agreement with the Johannine teaching on our Lord's pre-existence, and the fulness of divine Grace which was revealed in Him.

What are we to understand by 'all things,' which Jesus said had been delivered to Him by the Father ? Already we have seen that He had been anointed to preach and to heal. The next section will unfold still further our Lord's consciousness of the great committal. Schmiedel[3] makes everything turn on the word 'know,' and gives to our Lord's knowledge a purely metaphysical connotation. He thinks that Jesus had *discovered* what others had failed to recognize ; that He *felt* Himself to be God's son, and the "thought of being God's son made Him feel in addition that He was sent by God to reveal this knowledge to His brethren." This leads

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *Person of Jesus Christ*, 415.
[2] Garvie, *Inner Life*, 270.
[3] *Johannine Writings*, 64–66.

to the conclusion that " Jesus cannot have called Himself Son of God in a sense which only applies to Himself." But this is exactly what Jesus does, both in respect to His knowledge of the Father and the Father's knowledge of Him. He has a consciousness of the Father which no one else has ; and the logion claims that all things had been delivered unto Him by His Father. This excludes the purely human view of Jesus as a seeker after God ; as the One who made the great discovery of divine Fatherhood and gave His information to the race. When these words are interpreted through the Old Testament view of revelation, or in the light of their immediate context, or from what we know of the Person and work of Jesus in the Gospels, we cannot fail to discern that they state some stupendous facts in the operation of the divine Will. Fatherhood on the lips of Jesus is not merely information. He interprets Fatherhood in the terms of motive. Jesus openly confesses that His knowledge on some matters is limited ;[1] but concerning the nature and ultimate purpose of the Father He claims here that His knowledge is unique. And the knowledge He had was no other than a consciousness of the eternal motive of the Father culminating in Himself and in Himself alone. The Father was objective to Jesus, and by direct action had delivered to Him all things ; that is, He had committed to Jesus the endowment necessary for a unique task, the task of making known fully and accomplishing finally the divine Will in the created world. The first evangelist defines this great committal as the will of God in Jesus to save His people from their sins. The Father gave Him power in His baptism to effect this will. On the other hand, the will of Jesus was as real as the will of the Father, and by continual response of His will He accepted the task laid upon Him by His Father's Grace. It was the fulness and finality of the Father's gracious motive which Jesus revealed in being true to the Father's Great Committal. " Neither doth any know the Father save the Son . . . and he to whomsoever

[1] Matt. 24. 36.

the Son willeth to reveal Him." Jesus was giving to men much more than information of the Father's gracious disposition. As we point out in the second part of this work, the appeal of divine Grace is always to the will. And just as the Grace of the Father, when He delivered all things to Jesus, appealed to the whole strength of our Lord's will, so the revelation of the Father's gracious motive by Jesus makes its central appeal to the human will. This passage shews how completely, in the Person of Jesus, the objective and subjective aspects of His consciousness were a unity, setting forth the magnificence of the Father's Grace.

F. Our Lord's Authority

1. *Our Lord's Authority to Forgive Sins*

It was inevitable that the Legalists should raise the question of the authority of Jesus at the earliest opportunity. It would be regarded as His most vulnerable point of attack; and to defeat Him on such an issue would be to discredit finally the religious value of His claims. The crowds had been deeply impressed by the self-evident authority of His Personality and teaching. Jesus appealed to no great teacher, nor past tradition, but relied on the original and inherent authority of His own message. It was the incident of the paralytic which first brought the matter to a crucial test.[1] Even then it was not the miracle, but Christ's claim to forgive the man's sins, that raised the issue of His authority as nothing else could have raised it. The Legalists could have had no better case against Him, while Jesus was clearly aware of the opposition which His claim had provoked. We have seen that the Legalists had a well-defined doctrine of forgiveness for which they claimed divine origin and authority. Forgiveness was regulated by divinely appointed channels. If forgiveness were granted by Jesus, Legalism could no longer claim to regulate the approach of man to God or God to

[1] Mc. 2. 1–12, and parallels.

man. The paralytic may or may not have been a pious member of the Jewish Church ; if he were, his sins were unintentional, and must be atoned for in the appointed way.[1] If he were not, his sins were intentional, and no forgiveness was possible. The amazing claim of Jesus to forgive his sins, in either case, was reckoned as blasphemy. If the paralytic belonged to the pious class, Jesus was usurping the incommunicable prerogative of the Most High. If he did not, Jesus was undermining the traditional views of divine judgment.

Each evangelist testifies to Christ's consciousness of power to forgive sins on the earth. The unique feature of this incident centres round the exercise of this power. The emotional effect produced on the multitude by the claim to such power was amazement mingled with fear. Only the Legalists, not the people, seem to have called the claim into question. The latter gave God praise and glory.

Thus early in His ministry Jesus made the Grace of God to abound in the heart of the sinner by giving effect to His Father's will concerning the paralytic. He knew that all the authority of the divine motive was vested in Himself and the faith of the paralytic and his friends provided the ethical condition through which that motive could be realized. There is this to be said for the Legalists : they stated the only possible alternative to our Lord's self-consciousness. Either He was what He claimed to be, or what they described Him—a blasphemer. How then can His authority to forgive sins be put to the test ? The reality of His claim must be tested by the experience of those whom He forgave and still forgives. If this test is brushed aside as too subjective we are entitled to ask what other remains ? It is as safe a test as is applied to any other form of human experience. Moreover, the man who is forgiven is most conscious of the objective Grace of Christ. To deny the reality and efficacy of forgiveness on the ground that it is miraculous is not to explain it, but rather to explain it away. Whatever is said to the contrary, this is a matter on which the man who has been forgiven *knows* that he has most

[1] Mc. 2. 7.

right to be heard. There is as much evidence regarding this experimental fact, as for any of the sciences which are built up by the patient method of observation and experiment. The forgiveness of sins is far too profoundly experimental to be gainsaid. And on this occasion it was a new experience in the history of the race, realized by a man under the historic conditions of the ministry, and due to the consciousness of divine Grace as exercised by Jesus. His authority to forgive was one of those things which He said had been delivered to Him by His Father. In giving it such effect on the earth, as Son of Man, He presented a stupendous contrast between Himself with His manifestation of divine Grace, and the Son of Man in First Enoch, who executed vengeance on all sinners, and mediated God's will in a cataclysmic act of judgment upon them.

Luke 7. 36–50

Simon may be regarded as a Pharisee who was well disposed to Jesus. He made no direct attack on our Lord's authority but he doubted if He were a prophet, since He failed to perceive the character of the woman who touched Him that she was a sinner. When Jesus uttered the parable of the two debtors[1] in order to explain what the woman had done to Him, and confirmed her previous experience of forgiveness,[2] they that sat at meat began to say within themselves, "who is this that even forgiveth sins?" Our Lord explained the woman's action as evoked by His full and free forgiveness (echarisato). The evidence of our Lord's power to forgive the sins of this woman lies in her action; but the relation of forgiveness to love will be discussed later. We are not told when, nor how, this woman had met Jesus and received forgiveness; but we are left in no doubt concerning the reality of her experience of divine Grace. And Jesus claims, and those who sit at meat understand it so, that He Himself had forgiven her freely. Following upon the forgiveness of the paralytic this incident

[1] *vv.* 41 f. [2] *v.* 48.

indicates that it was no occasional thing for our Lord to forgive sins ; this woman had been forgiven, and it was only Simon's treatment of her in relation to Jesus which gave publicity to the fact. To forgive sins was inherent in the unique endowment of the Father's Grace, and the gospels assume that the exercise of this prerogative was the normal procedure of our Saviour's historic ministry.

To do full justice at this point to the authority of Jesus to forgive sins on the earth would necessitate the review of a number of other incidents and passages in the Synoptic gospels, where the claim is implicit, or assumed. Jesus does not always stay to vindicate His authority to forgive sins. Toward the end of His ministry His opponents would seem to have been silenced on this issue, for they tested His authority on other matters. In such a passage as " I came not to call the righteous but sinners,"[1] Jesus speaks as one who is conscious of a unique mission to those whose need of divine Grace is deepest ; and He is the bearer of that Grace. On the cross He made an amazing promise of forgiveness to the dying malefactor : " To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise." Such a statement receives its fullest illumination in passages concerning the source and nature of His authority, as being from above,[2] and extending in scope to heaven and earth.[3] The authority which He exercised over unclean spirits, and which He communicated to the disciples must be related to the Father's objective control of His will. Behind all such claims, explicit or implicit, is the self-consciousness of Jesus as the one to whom the Father had delivered all things. In the light of His authority to be the bearer of divine Grace to men we must interpret our Lord's preaching as it is handed down to us in the Gracious Invitation and the parables of Grace. Further, we must understand the miracles as the putting forth of the same authority. These discussions are reserved for later treatment.

[1] Mc. 2. 17. [2] Mc. 11. 27. [3] Matt. 28. 18.

2. *Our Lord's Authority over the Sabbath*

On several occasions the Legalists attacked Jesus, directly or through His disciples, concerning the authority of His attitude to Jewish institutions, notably the Sabbath. As the disciples plucked the ears of corn in their journey through the sown fields, it was a breach of tradition sufficiently serious to furnish an accusation against Jesus.[1] When He was in the synagogue the Legalists watched Him, whether He would heal on the Sabbath day. According to the First evangelist, the Pharisees asked Jesus whether it was lawful to heal on the Sabbath day.[2] Mark and Luke say that Jesus asked the Pharisees whether it was lawful to save life on the Sabbath, or to destroy it. He restored the withered hand whole as the other : they went out and took counsel how they might destroy Him.

Luke alone records the cure of the woman who had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years.[3] The indignation of the ruler of the synagogue was typical of the temper of Legalism towards Jesus because He healed on the Sabbath. The Third gospel has a similar incident in the house of a Pharisee, where on the Sabbath day Jesus healed a man with dropsy, conscious throughout of the antagonism of the lawyers and the Pharisees.[4]

The opposition which Jesus encountered rested upon a deterministic conception of divine Grace in relation to the Sabbath. The Jewish Sabbath was instituted as a recognition that all time belonged to Jahweh. In lieu of the whole of the nation's time, Jahweh set apart one day as holy to Himself ; and its observance was a confession on the part of the people of the authority of Jahweh's claim over all their time. But the Jewish Sabbath had become burdened with so many traditions that there was no longer any room for the freedom of fellowship between God and man. The Legalists had sought to control the approach of man to God

[1] Mc. 2. 23–28, and parallels.
[2] Matt. 12. 10.
[3] 13. 10–17.
[4] 14. 1–6.

and God to man under the form of Time (the Sabbath), as minutely as they had done it under the form of Space. They hedged the Sabbath as they hedged the Holy of Holies ; and in doing so they forgot the value of man to God and enslaved him most on the day when he ought to have been free.

One of the most astonishing claims, therefore, that Jesus could have made against the Legalists was His Lordship of the Sabbath.[1] In reality, it was a claim that all time belonged to Him and had been put at His disposal for the accomplishing of His work of Grace. All time belonged to God, and in Jesus the will of God was *always* seeking to bless men. Jesus knew the mystery of the freedom of Grace ; " Ought not this woman, *a daughter of Abraham* (a member of the Jewish Church), to be loosed from her bond on the Sabbath day ? "[2] The Sabbath day was no more than a symbol that all time was an opportunity for the Grace of the Son of Man to accomplish His will. These incidents raise the question of the authority of Jesus in a most acute form. How does He answer ? By the exercise of His Gracious Will. Through His ministry of healing He gave men a new experience of divine Grace in relation to Time. The Fourth gospel brings this out very clearly. When the Jews objected to the healing of the man at the Bethesda pool on the Sabbath day, Jesus answered, " My Father worketh even until now and I work," identifying Himself with the ceaseless activity of the divine Will in its effort to redeem man.

3. *Our Lord's Authority over the Temple*

Mark 11. 27–33 ; *Matt.* 21. 23–27 ; *Luke* 20. 1–8

After the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, and the cleansing of the Temple, the Legalists again challenged our Lord's authority. They demanded to know its nature and its source. It was still the supreme issue ; and it was still hoped to discredit His credentials by Jewish standards.

[1] Mc. 2. 28. [2] Luke 10. 16.

The answer of Jesus is non-committal, like their answer to His question regarding the earthly and heavenly sanctions for the Baptist's work. He meant them to understand that John's authority, much more His own, was from above and not from the earth. If, however, they did not believe in the divine source of John's authority they were not likely to be convinced concerning His own. It is enough that Jesus implies that the nature and source of His authority would be obvious to the Legalists, were they not blinded by prejudice. The real answer to this attack, however, is given in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, where the source and nature of Christ's authority are clearly stated. He was the beloved Son, and His mission was one of Grace even to the Legalists. He was, and He was sent to make, the final appeal of divine Grace to the chosen people.

4. *Our Lord's Authority in the Great Commission*

Matt. 28. 18 f.

What the preceding passages affirm of the nature of Christ's authority, this post-resurrection statement affirms of its scope. Supposing these words did originate in the early congregation, they only make explicit the thought and claims of Jesus before the crucifixion. These words do no more than define the scope of His claim that "all things have been delivered unto me of my Father." He was entrusted with the manifestation and consummation of the divine purpose. And in giving final effect to the divine will it follows that He must be Judge as well as Redeemer. His authority on earth was to forgive sins: His authority in heaven is brought out clearly in His revelation of divine teleology or eschatology. Now we must understand our Lord's commission in the light of this earthly and heavenly authority. It was so that the disciples understood it; and overawed before His ultimate and absolute authority they never sacrificed the apocalyptic element in their commission

to the simply ethical. They never proclaimed the fact of divine Grace as something abstracted from divine justice. They saw judgment as the essential obverse of Grace. Both in earth and heaven our Lord's authority was due to the Grace of God. As Son of Man, however, He would consummate the Father's Grace, and execute divine judgment.

G. Our Lord at Prayer

The Synoptic gospels furnish the most convincing evidence for our Lord's subjective experience of Grace through prayer and its effects in His life and work. His unbroken communion with the Father must be seen in relation to His obedience, and to the perfect ethical ideal He was for others. The gospels tell of seasons in the life of the Master when His prayer was more intense than at other times, and such seasons immediately precede or follow the most far-reaching events in the ministry. What exact relation prayer had to His baptism, the voice from heaven, and the descent of the Holy Spirit, Luke does not specify. He points out, however, that in these august moments of His career Christ was praying. It is an indication of our Lord's subjective experience of which we should not lose sight. The baptism is presented in the First gospel as an act of complete surrender to the Father.[1] This surrender, and the descent of the Holy Spirit, the subjective and objective aspects of the baptismal experience, are related to prayer. Hence we are led to infer that on this occasion prayer was a means of Grace to Jesus.

After the day of miracles at Capernaum, Jesus rose up a great while before day and "departed into a desert place and there prayed." [2] Mark merely records the event, but he means us to see that Christ's prayer-experience was concerned with the day just passed and with the nature of His future work. Through such communion "He learnt that His

[1] Matt. 3. 15. [2] Mc. 1. 35.

mission was not to work miracles but to declare the Kingdom of God ; that He was first and foremost a Healer of souls." [1] The effect of such prayer reveals the objective control of the Father's Will over Christ.

Luke says (9. 28 f.) that Jesus went up into the mountain to pray ; and during His prayer the fashion of His countenance was altered. We may say that the " Transfiguration is almost represented as the effect of prayer." [2] It is clear that the Third evangelist relates our Lord's prayer-experience to those exalted moments when His Messianic consciousness was so clear that He was led to speak of His approaching death and resurrection. The significance of prayer for Christ's consciousness as the Messianic Sufferer should hold fast our attention. Before Peter's confession, before He began to teach the disciples the things He *must* suffer, He " was praying alone." [3] It is impossible to detach our Lord's prayer-experience from the conviction that He must suffer unto death. The conversation on the Mount was regarding " His decease which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem."

The prayer in the Garden is remarkable evidence for the control of the Father's Grace over our Lord's emotion and Will. Such words shew the moving of the deeps of Divine Personality ; how the deeps of the Father answered the call from the deeps of the Son. They shew that the great act of surrender was achieved under the constraint and inspiration of the Father's Grace. Such a means of Grace was prayer to His own soul in those critical moments, that He urged the disciples also to pray against the hour of their temptations.

Before the selection of the twelve disciples Jesus " continued all night in prayer to God." [4] Such communion was decisive in the appointment of the Twelve and the method of propagating the kingdom. The prayer for Peter reveals our Lord's consciousness of control over objective forces to the end of producing subjective effects in others.[5] Through His

[1] Bennett, *Life of Christ in St. Mark*, 24.
[2] E. R. Bernard, *D. B.*, IV. 43.
[3] Luke 9. 18.
[4] Luke 6. 12.
[5] Luke 22. 32.

prayer, the objective power of divine Grace moved to save Peter from utterly falling, even in the hour of his infidelity.

Our Lord's example is conclusive, that prayer is significant for the most exalted spiritual experience, that it is a means for producing the richest of subjective results. And His habit of prayer is vital to His Ethic. His moments of communion are full of intensest emotion and high resolve. Prayer has crucial importance for the adoption of His own methods in propagating the kingdom. It has everything to do with His knowledge of, and His surrender to, the Will of God concerning the cross. At His baptism, transfiguration, announcement of the passion, and in Gethsemane, prayer brought to the Redeemer clear vision, an inflow of emotion, and an access of power to effect a complete surrender to the Father's will. The synoptists have no doubt of the relation of prayer to sacrifice in our Lord's life and death. Thus they shew that the supreme exemplar of prayer as a means of Grace is Jesus Himself. This fact is tremendously impressive to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who sees in Christ's prayer-experience the earnest of His Great High Priesthood : " Who in the days of His flesh having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death ; and having been heard for His godly fear, though He was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things He suffered."[1] By reason of Christ's own experience of Divine Grace through prayer, Christians are exhorted to draw near to the throne of Grace to receive mercy and obtain help in time of need.[2]

It is necessary to guard against any mechanical explanation of the prayer-experience of Jesus. In such communion there was a reciprocity of action between His own Personality and that of His Father. Both were free. In such reciprocal activity Christ surrendered Himself completely to His Father's Will, and He was conscious of inspiration as He did so. The

[1] Heb. 5. 7. [2] 4. 16.

infinite objective resources, which Paul would describe as the unfathomable riches of divine Grace, became accessible to Jesus, and His own powers of volition transmuted them to effect the Father's purpose. Schmiedel thinks the prayer at the grave of Lazarus is inserted by John to shew "that Jesus did not need to pray for His own sake, but only for that of the people; and this He even explains to God in a prayer"[1] This is explaining the prayers of Jesus away as unreal. If such a view of the prayers of Jesus were tenable it would be nothing less than the snap of the spinal cord of Christianity. It is impossible to regard the Gospels as presenting reality at all if they present us with unreality in this matter. The prayers, persistence, and sacrifice of Jesus were His own achievements, and they were His working out of the immanent resources of His Father's Grace both for Himself and others. No one could leave a profounder impression of the vital relation between the objective and subjective aspects of Grace, or the relation of prayer to the Christian Ethic, than does Jesus. This is manifested in the whole range of His life, work and teaching. He conveys such an impression of the reality of prayer for the carrying out of His Father's purpose, that only the abstraction of such purpose from His life can lead to Schmiedel's conclusion.

H. Our Lord's Inspired Activity

Our Lord attributes His power to exorcise unclean spirits to the Spirit of God,[2] or the finger of God.[3] When this objective control of His subjective activity was challenged by the Legalists, and attributed to Beelzebub, He uttered the terrible warning concerning the blasphemy which hath never forgiveness. That is, in denying the gracious inspiration of His activity they committed the capital sin against divine Grace.

[1] *Johannine Writings*, 28.
[2] Matt. 12. 28. [3] Luke 11. 20.

Thus, the sin against the Holy Spirit is not the refusal to work out the divine power which is already at work within the human heart. This sin belongs more to the cognitive aspect of consciousness. It is the inference of a degenerate mind, which is held responsible for its own degeneracy, refusing to apprehend that the only source of Christ's power was holy and gracious. It attributes the ethical activities of Jesus to an unholy source, thereby confusing good with evil. And "to identify the source of good with the impersonation of evil implies a moral disease for which the Incarnation itself provides no remedy." [1] Our Lord's emphasis of the Grace of God as being the only explanation of His Ethic, could not have been stated more forcibly. His power to deliver men from their sins and to clothe them in their right mind was explained by Himself as due to the Spirit of His Father.

I. Our Lord's Death

1. *Its Necessity*

Before dealing with our Lord's preaching and miracles we continue to interpret His Personal experience as it culminates in His death and resurrection.

The space devoted by each evangelist to the death of Jesus is the best answer to those who hold that it is only in the epistles where the death of Christ receives elaborate attention. The synoptic treatment is at once more simple and less theological than that of the Epistles; but "while the mind of Jesus is more simple than that of the Apostles His emotions are more complex." The view that the Messianic congregation read its theological notions into the synoptic record, or coloured the words of Christ so as to give to His death a meaning which it never had for Himself, is more untenable to-day than at any time during the last generation.

[1] Swete, *Commentary on Mark, in loco.*

The exact period when our Lord became conscious that He must suffer a violent death has no such import to the evangelists as it would appear to have in the minds of many modern writers. Our Lord's method of making the fact known was by instruction : " He began to teach them." [1] Such a method suggests that not until then were the disciples able to receive His teaching, rather than that Jesus Himself was first conscious of the fact which He taught. One thing is clear, Jesus apprehended that His death was necessary and taught its necessity to His disciples. Each evangelist reports His emphatic utterance that " He *must* suffer many things and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed." [2]

Our Lord's consciousness of the necessity of His death must be interpreted through the purpose which the evangelists uniformly ascribe to Him. The teleology of His mission involved Him in violent conflict from which there was no moral escape. In spite of the misunderstanding of His mother and brethren, the disappointment with the multitudes and the dulness of His disciples, He continued to give effect to the gracious motive of His Father.

Since many of our Lord's words and deeds reveal an infinite tenderness and beauty we are apt to do less than justice to His tenacious will. The ease of many of our Lord's movements may mislead us. It must not be overlooked that it needed his indomitable will to make His own life and work so winsome and attractive in the days of the Galilean ministry. The art of the strong will lies in the ease with which it clothes its strength in gracious Personality and indefatigable labours of love. Behind the Galilean experiences, with their parables and acts of Grace, there is an august power of will. In the authority to forgive sins on the earth ; in the sermon at Nazareth ; in the claims of Lordship over Jewish institutions, we discern a calm but stupendous power of will, moving without deviation to its goal. To say " the thought that he might be the divinely selected one, may have been remote

[1] Mc. 8. 31. [2] Mc. 8. 31, and parallels.

from the beginning "[1] is as shallow a psychological estimate of the Galilean ministry as can be found. Nor was it Peter's confession that ripened His decision to make a final move. Nor is it from that time forward " that everything points to a great determination, a bold undertaking, a decided purpose." [2] The decided purpose is manifest in the baptism. It had been the most decisive and final thing in Jesus from that event. Pfleiderer would have us think that certain events at Cæsarea Philippi deflected or influenced the purpose of Jesus, to risk all in an attack on the Jewish hierarchy ; whereas, it was the motive of Jesus which had led up to, and gave events their turn at Cæsarea Philippi. Jesus never gives us the impression that circumstances are influencing more than His methods : they are never presented as creating His motives. If one thing stands out prominently during these critical days in the north, it is that the purpose which Christ had resolved from the first had led Him at last, not to the blind alley of Schweitzer, but to the conviction that to carry through His vocation without flinching involved Him in suffering a violent death. It is this conviction which the Transfiguration confirms. Moses and Elijah " spake of His decease which He was about *to accomplish* at Jerusalem." [3] Again, also, ' the voice ' assured Him and His disciples of His divine Sonship and Authority.

Jesus had made His appeal to the will of man. Instead of surrender, however, He often met a response that challenged His authority and His mission. In some cases antagonism was so pronounced as to become threatening to His Person.[4] When He says that the Bridegroom shall be taken away, He throws out a hint of the end of the opposition which He has already encountered. The object of His opponents was to break His purpose by breaking Him. In a very real sense, then, the issue presented itself as one between Christ's will and their will. And since battle was joined, He must surrender the mission for which He came into the world, or

[1] *Christian Origins*, 123. [2] *Ibid.*, 124.
[3] Luke 9. 31. [4] Luke 4. 28 f.

accept the consequences of the will of His foes in giving full effect to the objective and gracious will of His Father.

The tenacity and direction of Christ's will at Cæsarea Philippi made a profound impression on His followers. Peter began to rebuke Him, but the disciple was addressed in turn as Satan, as a *skandalon*, as one who minded not the things of God but the things of men. On another occasion the disciples were afraid to ask Him regarding His death.[1] As they journeyed to Jerusalem, Jesus adopted the unusual course of going before them, and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid.[2] His baptism of passion, or His subjective activity as it was controlled by the mightiest of all divine energies, the gracious will of His Father to save men,[3] overawed them.

The subjective aspect of our Lord's passion will throw further light on His own death. To the sons of Zebedee, and in the Garden of Gethsemane, He speaks of His death after the manner of drinking a cup. The Fourth gospel makes explicit what is understood in the Synoptics: it is the Father who hands Jesus the cup. The Master is conscious that to drink it will effect finally and completely the purpose of divine Grace. In other words, He must give His life freely and accomplish His will through all the gathering storm and opposition.

1. *The Triumphal Entry* gives us the true key-note of the passion. However the disciples or the multitudes construed this event, it introduces us to the true temper of Jesus during these days. It was, even for Him, conscious of all the violence which awaited Him, the true estimate of His passion. He saw it all, with its appalling demand upon His thought, emotion, and will as an eternal triumph. When He drew nigh the city He wept over it. He knew that the triumphant march of His Grace would bring it down in ruins. Jesus entered Jerusalem in no spirit of pessimism nor burdened with the sense of impending failure, but confident that His will would achieve the undying triumph of the Grace of God.

[1] Mc. 9. 31. [2] Mc. 10. 32. [3] Luke 12. 50; Mc. 10. 38–45.

2. Each Evangelist records the prayer in Gethsemane, focussing attention on the terrible nature of the *peirasmos*, He "began to be greatly amazed and sore troubled."[1] Prayer with such agony has no meaning unless it indicates the character of Christ's conflict in making His surrender to the will of the Father. The thrice-repeated words shew that the struggle centres in His will. It is one of the rare instances in the Synoptic gospels where we are given the exact words of the Master's prayer; and such words are deeply significant as an index to the cost of what He was about to do. Luke records a gracious answer to His prayer. An angel from heaven strengthened Him. But what He does is something positive, and in His prayer, He always conceives Himself as doing it, not as having it done to Him.

3. Our Lord indicates some elements in His cup, and the Evangelists state others.

He rebukes the treachery of Judas. He reproaches the methods and motives of His enemies.[2] His silence before Pilate; His stand beside Barabbas; the mock coronation and worship; the inability to bear His cross and the wounds of the Crucifixion; the railing of the multitude; the challenge to save Himself; the consciousness that God had forsaken Him; His compassion on the ignorance of His murderers, and His prayer that forgiveness might be granted unto them; the commendation of His spirit into the hands of His Father: "these suggest the burden He was bearing, and the struggle He was waging during these hours of unceasing trial to His spirit as well as of weariness to His flesh between the acceptance and presentation of His sacrifice."[3] It is essential to understand that all the above incidents were explained by Jesus in relation to something which He did—the drinking of a cup. Jesus describes all the convulsive forces which converge against Him, as something which He meets, not as a helpless victim, but as one who gives abiding objective effect to the eternal motive of God.

[1] Mc. 14. 33. [2] Mc. 14. 48 f.
[3] Garvie, *Inner Life*, 406.

When we consider our Lord's passion in the light of His own interpretation as something which He accomplished, it becomes impossible to accept a view of His death in which His passivity is explained as the central fact. Nowhere does our Lord conceive Himself as a victim ; as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, " He endured the cross, and He *despised* its shame."

Edward Caird sees the necessity of Jesus' death as the inevitable result of His conflict with the Jew and the Roman. It is through this unavoidable conflict that Caird explains the cross, and claims that this is true to the Synoptic gospels as against Paul. The death of Jesus is said to have been brought about by the opposition of its own principle, which would mean that human evil was *necessary* to give universal value to our Lord's death ; or, as Pfleiderer adds, crucifixion at the hands of His enemies " was the inevitable, providential means of His entrance into a higher life."[1] That is, evil was necessary to the evolution of the divine purpose. Because Caird cannot conceive an eternal dualism between good and evil, he sacrifices the real nature of evil, by making it the necessary instrument of good. On this view, ' necessity ' belongs to evil, rather than to the purpose of Jesus. According to the synoptic evidence, however, the conflict in which Jesus was involved was due to that which His own will initiated, and others opposed. Jesus knew His own will, and He knew that evil had its seat in the will of His opponents. There is a vital difference between this view of evil and Caird's. To the latter the view of the conflict in which Jesus was involved was metaphysical rather than ethical. It would be idle to speculate regarding what did not occur in the experience of Jesus. But if sin is the thing that Caird conceived ; a lower degree of good—the resurrected Socratic theory of sin as ignorance—then it is safe to say that there would have been no such explanation by Jesus in the gospels of His own death. On Caird's view the death of Christ can achieve no more than a redemption of the intellect.

[1] *Christian Origins*, 129.

There is no room for that transcendent and moral necessity which Jesus claimed in the gospels, both for His life and mission. Caird's statement of the necessity of the death of Jesus is based on his Pantheistic explanation of good and evil. Consequently, he thinks that the most characteristic thing in Jesus is His confidence in God and goodness, and that His death is the promise of the final triumph of good. This is true as far as it goes, but it fails to go far enough. It does not allow room for that Doctrine of divine Grace which is revealed in our Lord's quest for sinful men. We should say that the most characteristic thing in Jesus was the stupendous power of His will to love and suffer (due to the prompting of the Grace of His Father), and His consciousness of giving final effect to the Father's will to save men : a salvation in which His control of the human will would be effected by His love to men.

In keeping with this view of the necessity of our Lord's death, Caird looks upon Jesus as a victim of evil, a passive soul, whose outstanding virtue was His individual renunciation for the sake of universal gain. True, He is said to have abstracted the sting of evil by drawing all its malice and violence upon Himself. Further, by His non-resistance, He was enabled to realize the principle of die-to-live in His own life.

Now such views of the passivity of Jesus receive no countenance whatever in His explanation of His own death. There is surrender in the will of Jesus, but it is the surrender of His will to His Father. He was master, not a victim, of events. Moreover, it becomes us to speak with great caution on the nature of our Lord's renunciation. It is certainly misleading to say that Jesus renounced His egotism, as Caird does. For one thing, He had no false egotism to renounce. It was as impossible for Him to renounce His egotism, as to renounce His Personality and purpose. The true view is to realize that our Lord always takes a positive view of His death, and that His *egotism* is the assertion of His Grace.

The attempt to go behind Paul, and get rid of the tran-

scendent values which he attributes to the death of Christ, by shewing from the Synoptic gospels that Jesus had no transcendental ideas on His death, is broken on the fact of the necessity which Jesus ascribed to His own passion. "The necessity for His death was primarily created and forced by Himself in God's name ; not indeed as if He was obsessed by an artificial and advertising form of suicide, but as the result of certain eschatological convictions about God's procedure and requirement which would now be called dogmatic rather than simply ethical. We are here far beyond the mean conception which reduces His death to a mere martyrdom, and makes Christ a sufferer historically as passive as He has sometimes been viewed theologically to be. . . . He was also more than the classic case, or the sacrificial protagonist, of the great human tragedy and fate. He was really the ruling power of the public situation and the arbiter of the future."[1]

This section which deals with the strenuous exertions of our Lord's will even unto death, is a study in His subjective experience of the Father's Grace. We see Him acting under the inspiration of its objective control. His will is rising to the demands of the Father's redemptive will, and in the interaction of the wills of Father and Son the latter is conscious of those unfathomable resources which are sufficient for all His suffering and endurance.

In addition to the fact of its necessity, Jesus expresses three other views of His death which present it as an objective manifestation of divine Grace. These are found in the Ransom Passage, the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, and the Last Supper.

2. *The Ransom Passage*

Mc. 10. 45 ; *Matt.* 20. 28 ; cf. *Luke* 22. 27

It is admitted by Pfleiderer that this passage teaches vicarious atonement ; but he says that such a thought was

[1] Forsyth, *Expositor*, July, 1915, 76.

entirely strange to Jesus, and that the evangelist makes Jesus Himself utter Paul's interpretation of the death on the cross.[1] Criticism to-day is growing more reluctant than ever to accept this view. On no actual evidence can the genuineness of this passage be called in question. The only reason for disputing it is philosophical. It forms an integral part of a discussion in which Jesus was led to speak of His passion as the drinking of the cup. The saying is but another way of elucidating the necessity of His death, and the transcendent purpose which it would serve. "The Son of Man *came* not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

1. There has been considerable discussion as to the exact meaning of *lutron*, and for whom the *lutron* was made. There can be no doubt that it was made for lives which were under forfeit. It has been pointed out that the Priestly Code knew of no *kopher*[2] for forfeited lives—those guilty of intentional sins; for the sin which thrust men out of a state of Grace, or the sins which led God to cast men off, P. knew of no ransom. As far then as the Priestly Code helps us to understand the condition of the life under forfeit, it is the same condition that Jesus Himself described by the word 'lost.' Even the Jewish view of divine Grace, to the mind of Jesus, did not furnish a ransom which could be substituted for His own. The inadequacy of the Law in this matter was realized by the Psalmist; "none of them (boasters of wealth) can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him (for the redemption of their soul is costly and must be let alone for ever)."[3] Jesus came to give His life a ransom, a price paid in exchange, the price of a new spiritual heritage for man.

2. The sons of Zebedee had requested that Jesus should shew them an act of Grace. He replied that only their ignorance of divine Grace had led them to make such a request. He then explained the nature of the act of Grace which He would accomplish for them by laying down His life

[1] *Christian Origins*, 220.
[2] Covering.
[3] Ps. 49. 7 f.; cf. Job 33. 24.

as a ransom. His Grace was costly to Himself, and would be transmuted into unique service through the giving of His life. Such words amounted to nothing less than a complete revolution in their thinking on divine Grace. It rebuked their expectations of gratuitous favour at the hand of God, by shewing that the objective magnificence of God's Grace was manifested in Jesus as the Sufferer who came to give His life a ransom for many. When we relate this thought to our Lord's authority to forgive sins, and the profoundly ethical character of His forgiveness, we have the ideas through which we must interpret the service which He rendered to the souls under forfeit. He is then seen to be explaining His terrible expenditure of moral passion, the cost of divine Grace to forgive sins. The one word which comprehends this service to many is 'reconciliation.' It is a word which is never used by Jesus to explain His own work, but the fact is there, written clearly in His experience as reported in the Synoptic gospels. His will was devoted to the end of seeking and reconciling men to His Father. To the Sons of Zebedee, and the angry ten, He explained that He had come to render this specific service, and He leaves them in no doubt that the Grace of God prompted His action. When we set this passage in relation to our Lord's views on the necessity of His death—and we have a right so to set it—it distinctly points to the conclusion that He conceived the necessary giving of His life as vicarious, and as such, an objective manifestation of divine Grace. This is a statement so explicit as to constitute a distinct advance on earlier expressions of our Lord's purpose. And this view of atonement through Christ's death, implied in Mark's gospel, is coming to be recognized to-day among the advanced scholars of Europe and America.[1]

3. What does our Lord accomplish for the souls under forfeit? "The meaning of the sentence unambiguously is that the forfeited lives of many are liberated by the surrender

[1] See Forsyth, *Exp.*, July, 1915, 81, especially footnote. Also Sanday, *Recent Research*, 96.

of Christ's life."[1] His fulfilment of the Divine Will brings a new consciousness of liberation to the sinner. His sacrifice was a ministry through which the forfeited life was to receive the divine Grace as dynamic. Fairbairn finds the equivalent statement concerning our Lord's ransom in the Johannine sentence, "the truth shall make you free."[2] As he points out, our Lord desired His disciples to understand that His service was, and theirs must be, "the antithesis of what exists in the ethnic kingdoms,"[3] thus relating His vicarious death to the service which He demanded of the disciples. This implied that the giving of our Lord's life had objective significance for the attainment of His ethical ideal.

If it is replied that this is far from explicit in the ransom passage, we claim that such an interpretation is soundly justified, when the passage is set in the light of the *whole* Personality and motive of Jesus as stated in the Synoptic gospels. There we see that the mightiest thing in Jesus is the Grace of God, and the will to give it final effect. However or wherever the will of Jesus operates, in Galilee, in Gethsemane, or on Calvary, it always operates in men as spiritual energy. In the days of His flesh, through penitence, faith, and prayer, men felt that the mightiest force in their experience was due to the objective control of the will of Jesus. Even beyond the cross our Lord was conscious that His will would continue to be the uncharging objective reality which it had been during His life to His disciples, and it would finally triumph.

3. *The Wicked Husbandmen*

Mc. 12. 1–12 ; *Matt.* 21. 33–45 ; *Luke* 20. 9–18

This parable is really our Lord's answer to the question regarding the source of His authority. He expands Isaiah's song of the vineyard,[4] shewing that He is conscious of occupying the place of the Messiah in Jewish history. The Grace of

[1] Denney, *Death of Christ*, 45.
[2] 8. 32.
[3] *Expositor*, Series V, Vol. IV, 425.
[4] Isaiah 5. 1–7.

God to Israel in initiating the covenant is implied, as also is Israel's double failure to keep the covenant obligations. First, Jahweh is said to have received no fruits of the vineyard, a startling criticism on the barrenness of Jewish ethics. Secondly, His servants have been handled shamefully, and some indeed killed. Jesus explains that the Grace of God to the nation has been hindered and rejected.

The central fact in the parable is Christ's relating of Himself to the Theocratic idea. He is conscious of being the 'beloved Son,' whose mission is to appeal to the Jewish people to submit themselves to the crowning purpose of their history. He is also clearly conscious of the issues of His own appeal, both as regards Himself and the nation. He sees that His own death will be at one and the same time the fulfilment of God's purpose and the occasion of God's judgment.

In this parabolic presentation of history Jesus shews again the moral necessity of His death. Whatever occurs He cannot surrender His mission nor acknowledge defeat. He came not to punish the husbandmen as they deserved, but in the fulness of the Grace of God to appeal to them. In making such an appeal in the name of divine Grace He sees the necessity of His death.

Our Lord's estimate of the motive of the husbandmen in killing Him, the Son, is worthy of close attention: "Let us kill him that the inheritance may be ours." This is another verdict by Jesus regarding the motive of Jewish exclusiveness. If the validity of Judaism were eternal, and the Hierarchy claimed that it was, the Grace and goodness of God must flow through the Jewish Church to the world, and could flow through no other channel. On this ground Judaism repudiated Christ's doctrine of Grace. It challenged His authority to forgive sins, and questioned the motive of His works of unearned compassion. It refused to recognize that in the Personality of Jesus the divine quest for man was ultimately demonstrated. This motive for exclusiveness, to keep the inheritance for themselves, was due to the Jewish doctrine of Grace as arbitrary favour; and the judgment of

Jesus on this view is set forth both in the parable and in the words on the rejected stone.

The parable has considerable bearing on the relation of the death of Jesus to His eschatological teaching. It testifies that He was conscious of His own significance both for the fulfilment of divine Grace and Judgment. The husbandmen had failed to yield their fruits to God and nothing could save them from doom. There could scarcely be a more scathing condemnation, nor one more likely to incite anger in the Hierarchy, than this aspect of the parable. As the evangelists say, they knew it was uttered against them, and they sought to lay hands on Him in that very hour. Such a view throws added emphasis on our Lord's teaching elsewhere, that Grace which is not appropriated or yields no corresponding ethic passes over into Judgment.

4. *The Lord's Supper*

Mc. 14. 12–26; *Matt.* 26. 17–30; *Luke* 22. 7–39; cf. 1 *Cor.* 11. 23–25

A. *Critical Questions*

There are certain textual difficulties in the Synoptists' account of the Last Supper. The common tradition is that at the table Jesus took bread, and when He had blessed it, He brake it, and gave to them, and said, "Take ye, this is my body." And He took a cup and when He had given thanks He gave to them. Mark and Matthew report that Jesus said "this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many." Luke and Paul define the covenant as 'new': "this cup is the new covenant in my blood"; "even that," says Luke, "which is poured out for you." Matthew adds "unto the remission of sins." The first two evangelists, who are recognized as handing on the earliest tradition, omit the words "do this in remembrance of Me," which are found in Luke and Paul. Such omission has led to the conclusion on

the part of some that our Lord gave no directions that the meal was to be repeated. The Lord's Supper as an institution is then attributed to Paul. Garvie's explanation assumes the Marcan tradition to be original and allows for the principle of development along the mind of Jesus. "That Jesus should desire to be remembered by His disciples is certain; that in view of the importance He assigned to His death and their indifference to its purpose He should desire to be remembered as dying, as offering the sacrifice of a new covenant, is in the highest degree probable; but it is unlikely that He instituted a mysterious rite to be only observed in separation from the common life of His disciples—as has been the case with regard to this memorial feast. What He wanted was to be always remembered in every common meal of the Christian community as thus offering His life to save men."[1]

It seems to the writer that the latter sentence scarcely allows for the transmutation of the Passover Feast, which was an institution and which is associated with the Supper in the earliest synoptic tradition. Then Mark and Matthew point out that "as they were eating," Jesus arrested the attention of the twelve by taking bread and a cup and relating the physical to the mystical by such words as "this is my blood of the covenant." This is conclusive that the Supper has close association with the common meal, but it also points to it being supplementary to, and distinctive from, that meal. Such distinction would explain one element in Paul's protest against the confusion of the Supper with the common meal in 1 Corinthians 11.

We conclude that at the table Jesus did two things, He took bread and gave thanks and brake it, and He took a cup. The disciples also did two things, they took from Him the bread, and Mark says, "they all drank of the cup." Our Lord explained the wine which He gave and which they drank as a symbol of His blood, which He further defined as blood of the covenant, which was shed for many.

Spitta and Bousset interpret these words apart from

[1] *Inner Life*, 367.

the cross of Jesus: they claim that they had nothing "directly to do with the thought of His death."[1] Spitta regards the supper as a farewell meal, a promise that the apocalyptic banquet, which he says loomed so large in the expectation of the disciples, should not fail—which on Spitta's hypothesis is exactly what did fail, since it did not occur during the lifetime of the disciples. He has to reckon with our Lord's words "my blood of the covenant," but concludes that Jesus was referring to the Davidic-Messianic covenant. "There is, however, no prophetic passage which joins together the conceptions of the Messianic covenant and of a feast, so that no explanation is offered of the association of the one with the other in the mind of Jesus."[2] Spitta draws on the parables which represent the Parousia as a wedding feast or great supper, and through these, and our Lord's eschatological teaching, of which there is evidence in the address at the table,[3] he interprets the Last Supper. We believe that such an explanation fails to do justice to the objective character of Grace as revealed in the words and acts of the Lord Jesus at the table.

B. *The New Covenant*

It is the common tradition of the synoptists that our Lord uttered the words, "this is my blood of the covenant." *Diathēkē* is a new word in our sources, and it is a pregnant word, one which sheds fresh light on the character of our Lord's will. Like a golden thread the consciousness of the covenant-relation ran through Israel's national existence. It was the root idea of the Jewish Church, whose deepest conviction was that the eternal motive of God could never return upon itself. The innermost nature of the covenant at Sinai was its revelation of Jahweh's objective grace to Israel. What connotation, then, had the idea of covenant in the mind of Jesus? It is certain that we cannot discover our Lord's

[1] Bousset, *Jesus*, 206. [2] Vos, *D. C. G.*, I, 376 b.
[3] Mc. 14. 25.

meaning anywhere outside His own interpretation of His Person and work, as we have so far sought to understand them. No one doubts that the Sinaitic covenant with the nation, or the new covenant with the individual in Jeremiah, was due to the initiative of divine Grace. And when Jesus used the words, " my covenant-blood," He surely meant that He was initiating something new by His sacrifice, and that the motive which prompted His action was gracious. Our Lord knew that to every Jew the word ' covenant ' called up the most vivid thoughts and emotions as he dwelt on God's loving-kindness. And when He declared that His blood would also establish a covenant, He meant that there was that in His act, which would enshrine as an objective reality the ultimate motive and sacrificial character of the Father's Grace.

It is unsatisfactory to construe our Lord's words " my blood of the covenant " through any methods of blood manipulation in the Old Testament. The ratification of the covenant in Exodus 24. by the sprinkling of the blood upon the people who had already consented to the covenant, shews that the sacrifices of the Old Testament were never regarded as initiating the covenant, at the best their aim went no further than to confirm and conserve the covenant-relationship. The only reason for the existence of the Priestly Code is that the covenant is already a historical fact.

The function of the blood in Old Testament sacrifices is stated clearly in Leviticus : " for the life of the flesh is in the blood : and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls : for it is the blood which maketh atonement by reason of the life."[1] When it is asked, how, or why, does the blood make atonement, or how is the blood related to guilt, the Old Testament does not say. As far as the Old Testament is concerned the question was never asked. We know that on the Day of Atonement when the laying on of hands signified a transference of guilt, the goat for Azazel was not a sacrificial victim. That is, the goat for

[1] 17, 11.

Azazel bears the sins of the people away, because Jahweh ordained that it should do so, even when its blood was not poured out before Him. Again, were the guilt of the people transferred to the sacrificial victim, whose blood makes atonement, the victim would be unclean, whereas it is holy and eaten by the priests. Moreover, it was the priests who performed the atonement ritual. Kautzsch is led to the conclusion that the indispensable condition of forgiveness was a full compliance with the Priestly Code. "The Jews sacrificed, just indeed as they maintained many other customs, because God commanded them so to do: that seemed a sufficient, and indeed a complete answer to the 'why' of sacrifice."[1] The Old Testament regards forgiveness as belonging to him who keeps the commandment.

The above reasoning must not prevent a proper appreciation of sacrifice in the experience of the Jewish worshipper. That sacrifice occupied a vital place in his worship is not open to doubt. It never seems to have occurred to any Jewish thinker, however, before Philo, to speculate on the 'why' of sacrifice; but Gray shows that for Philo sacrifice was never divorced from genuine religious experience. "Homage, thanksgiving, propitiation" were the three purposes which Philo discerned in sacrifice. "The spoken commands are manifest symbols of what is unknown and unseen."[2] "You see that soul is nourished, not on earthly and corruptible food, but on words which God showers from His sublime and pure nature, which is called Heaven. We cannot exhaust the abundant wealth of the graces of God."[3] "Everything," says Philo, "is due to Grace." The perils of sacrifice were very real to the eighth-century prophets, for they saw the effects of its abuse. We have pointed out that Jahweh's *ḥesedh* was avowed to Israel and that it passed into human experience through faith and obedience. The vital necessity for con-

[1] G. Buchanan Gray, *Expositor*, May, 1915, 388. See Gray's citation from *Yoḥanan ben Zakkai*.

[2] Gray. *ibid.*, 390 f.

[3] Quoted by J. T. Marshall, *Expositor*, June, 1911, 525. See article for "Philo's Conception of Grace."

serving the experience of *hesedh* was increasingly felt by the Jewish Church, and the ritual of sacrifice, because it was, as Philo said, 'a spoken command,' came to be appreciated as purely educational, sacramental, and symbolical of the teleological unveiling of Jahweh's *hesedh*, which alone had the potency of atonement for the unintentional sinner. It was recognized by the Jewish Church that God alone forgave sins, and sacrifice was sacramental, since it was Jahweh's appointed way of pardon.

Now the objective character of Jewish ritual as explained above has profound significance for the understanding of our Lord's words, "this is my blood of the covenant." He was speaking to men by whom sacrifice was regarded as a divine institution for the confessing and the putting away of sin; and in contrast to sacrifice which was symbolic in religious experience under the old dispensation, He affirms that His sacrifice will be effective in initiating a new covenant: that is, His death will have an absolute objective value for all their future experience, and the experience of the race. From it shall flow those abiding objective energies of Grace which shall be accessible to all whose faith and obedience appropriate them.

In this connection the argument of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews concerning the objective character of the new covenant might be recalled. He says that the Old Testament sacrifices were *skia*, a shadow, "old and wearing out and nigh unto vanishing away": they were mere symbols and there was nothing sacramental about them. They were not types fulfilled in the sacrifice of Jesus. "They were 'things made,' mechanical institutions, and were to be shaken and removed so that the realities which are not shaken might abide."[1]

On the other hand, the writer of the Epistle calls the true symbol *eikon*, and it is in this sense that he wishes his readers to understand that the death of Jesus on the cross was truly sacramental, for it was an eternal sacrifice

[1] Nairne, *Epistle of Priesthood*, 142.

for sin. Writing for men who were familiar with Alexandrine forms of thought, he says that Christ's sacrifice was the 'substance,' and the Old Testament sacrifices were 'shadows.' In this way he gave an eternal objectivity to the sacrifice of Jesus, such as nothing in heaven and in earth could shake. It was an act which embodied the abiding reality of divine Grace for men. Consequently, when the author comes to discuss the relation of guilt to blood in the Old Testament sacrifices, he says that "it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins."[1] Had the Priestly Code, then, promised a forgiveness which it could not, and never did, mediate? No. It must be remembered that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by one who knew the substance as distinct from the shadow; but that does not mean that Old Testament sacrifices never had any importance for true religious experience. Those who were obedient to the divine appointment of sacrifice were forgiven. But as Nairne says, "it is hard to suppose that any thoughtful Jew believed" that the blood of bulls and goats did take away sin, or "that the Old Testament was meant to say that it did."[2] The sacrificial system of the Old Testament was a concession to creaturely weakness; still, to the Jew it was educational and sacramental; but it could not be so any longer to one who, like the writer to the Hebrews, had experienced the sacramental Grace which was made eternally objective through the cross to penitence and faith.

Now we believe that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews is making boldly explicit the same objective potency of divine Grace in the death of Jesus, which was present to the mind of the Master when He said, "this is my blood of the covenant." He meant that His blood was the true sacrificial blood, an eternal sacrament of regenerating and inspirational Grace to the penitent and the believing. The reaction from crass theories of the atonement has led to a view of our Lord's death which is too subjective, and which fails to estimate correctly the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice for overcoming sin

[1] 10. 4. [2] p. 140.

and its effects in the race. The subjective aspects of His death have been recognized in the preceding section, where attention was drawn to our Lord's will as inspired by the Grace of the Father to achieve the Father's end. The subjective experience as thus set forth appeals to the already morally awakened; but the intellectual capacity for appreciating the subjective aspect of the atonement is the very thing that is lacking, and needs evoking, in the morally lapsed, particularly in the outcast type, such as the Magdalene or the dying malefactor; and it is when we attempt some understanding of what the cross has done for such degenerate hearts that we are driven to the conclusion that it has an indisputable objective value such as the New Testament claims for it. It is impossible to whittle down the cross by saying that it was the high-water mark of human heroism in the service of an ideal; it was more; it was God's act in Jesus Christ, a divine intervention in history which man had polluted by his own sin. Matthew reports our Lord as saying that His "blood of the covenant was shed for many unto the remission of sins." Jesus declared that His sacrificial blood was that which touched the fundamental instinct of the human heart, however depraved that heart was. He, Son of God, incarnate Grace, poured out His blood as symbolic of His whole Personality, "unto remission of sins."

There is no serious critical objection to the word 'new' in our Lord's reference to the covenant.[1] When we turn to Jeremiah we find the new covenant involved an experience in which God and man were most intimately related. In the new covenant of Jeremiah the individual was conscious of divine Grace initiating him into a knowledge of the divine character and a personal experience of the forgiveness of sins. This experience is similar to that which we find in the Synoptic gospels in those whom Jesus forgave; that is, in the experience of the forgiveness of sins, Jesus occupied on the earth the place which God occupied in the experience described by Jeremiah. Now the shedding of His blood unto the remission

[1] Jülicher thinks *kainē* is possibly original.

of sins is consistent with the experience effected by Christ's Personality during His ministry. If the blessing of forgiveness, which our Lord initiated and sustained during the historic ministry, was described by Him as the effect of the divine purpose, in what sense does He speak of His death as instituting a new covenant ? He means us to understand that His whole experience is one seamless robe, and the fact to keep in mind is that suffering was its warp and woof. This should help us to see still further the cost to Jesus of the new covenant in His blood.

It is most probable that our Lord's thoughts and words in the upper room, as on other occasions, were coloured by the experience of the Suffering Servant. But the sufferings of the Servant were inspired by the suffering Grace of God, which our Lord knew well from His reading of Deutero-Isaiah. We must never lose sight of the working of our Lord's will in the institution of the new covenant by the pouring out of His blood. It is the *task* before His will which is so vividly present to Him. And in this supreme effort of will there is much to suggest that He was profoundly conscious of the surge of divine Grace in Himself. He would know that previously the same surge had risen highest in the suffering love of God as portrayed by Deutero-Isaiah. The prophet had pointed out then, that it was no light thing for Jahweh to realize His purpose ;[1] that it was impossible for Him to barter His glory or surrender His covenant-purpose. There is an urge in Jahweh's passion to redeem Israel which we discern in the stupendous expenditure of moral energy on the part of Jesus. His Grace through His unique passion, wills to effect a particular and definite relation between Himself and men. The essential nature of the new covenant will be that man has *personal dealing* with Christ. The object of the suffering love of God and the Suffering Son was a people in covenant-relationship. So that our Lord could not have meant other than that His act, in which His whole Personality was objectified, would effect a bond of personal affection between Him-

[1] See Intro. : Grace in Deutero-Isa.

self and many, a bond initiated by divine Grace, and cemented by the inspirational energies of Grace, until the many became one in their relation to each other.

It follows, then, that our Lord's act of instituting the new covenant needs to be estimated on its internal side to learn the cost of forgiveness to God. When this is done, the intrinsic quality of our Lord's Grace is seen to lie in His will. "The precious and sacred thing was His holy, God-beloved will and its complete obedience of faith. There is the nerve of Personality, there is the seat of sanctity. There the great, eternal, final Redemption transpired. The value of the cross lies in its value as an act of Christ's soul and will."[1] But as Forsyth says, "Christ *was* God's act of Grace, and did not merely announce it."[2] From the beginning God's Grace was prompting His action in Christ, whose will was making the same Grace real and available for men. It flowed through His Personality and rose as a tide to its flood at the cross.

A number of writers hold that our Lord's death had no sacrificial import to His mind, because there was no need that it should have. This view is said to be based on His own teaching of divine forgiveness as free and unconditioned. But this is surely a radical misunderstanding of the nature of divine Grace as presented in the Gospels. Its chief error is to interpret Grace in the Greek sense, as the sunny and kindly attitude of God who is disposed to overlook sin, which also in the Greek sense is a lapse due to ignorance. This estimate takes no cognisance of the cost of forgiveness to God's Grace which is seen in the experience of Christ as the Suffering Servant. For us men this is the ultimate and pregnant fact to observe. The operation of the divine will in Jesus is consistent from His baptism to His cross; every act of His will initiated the Grace of God for man. This means that His Personality, whether in Galilee or Gethsemane, or on Calvary, was essentially sacrificial and sacramental; that He Himself

[1] Forsyth, *Expositor*, Series V, 8, 265.
[2] *Ibid.*, 268.

was the new covenant which He made completely effective by the shedding of His blood.

In view of this cost of divine forgiveness to God and His Son, as seen in the stress of Christ's will, it is impossible to speak of Grace as unconditional. Free it is, abundantly free, but the Synoptic gospels never present it as unconditional. The cost of Grace shews that it is not without conditions that God forgives. The moral conditions under which it operates in man will be made clearer in the second part of this work, which deals with Grace in its psychological aspects.

c. *Sacramental Grace*

The foregoing section has shewn the objective potency of our Lord's sacrifice. We now proceed to discuss the Master's unfolding in action of the sacramental Grace of His own death. This involves some attention to the subjective aspect of divine Grace in human experience ; for it is obvious that the objective reality of Grace as set forth in the instituting of the new covenant cannot be abstracted from the experience of those who receive it. It is impossible to discuss the symbolism in the upper room without considering at this point the psychological effect in the disciples of the objective potency of our Lord's sacrifice.

We read that Jesus took bread and wine ; of the former He said, " this is my body " ; of the wine He said, " this is my blood of the new covenant." That is, He used the bread and wine as simple illustrations of eternal and objective reality, which was the sacrifice of His body and blood for sin, and He used them as having so real a connection with that reality that they were effective means for comprehending it, " and that in action rather than in bare thought."[1] Thus His sacrifice " is shewn to be in a pre-eminent sense sacramental, revealing through its visible heroism the secret of the Saviour's Personality and work, and affording to His

[1] Nairne, 37.

servants a means of partaking in His effort and strength."[1] In the shedding of His blood we have seen at what cost our Lord's will responded to the Grace of the Father, and in the upper room, "the true symbol is not an element, it is an act"; one which had abiding efficacy and through which all the mighty and invisible energies of Grace became available for man's redemption. Our Lord's will was as objectively real to the disciples as the bread and wine were to their sight.

Now the taking of the symbols by the disciples has profound significance for the subjective experience of sacramental Grace. Eating the bread and drinking the wine are symbolic actions of the psychological function of faith in our Lord's sacrifice, and the appropriation by the will of eternal and invisible Grace. If this interpretation is said to be a reading into the supper of later views, we believe that the subjective experience of Grace preceding the Last Supper, as it is brought out in the second part of this work, shews that the above reasoning is in line with the disciples' past experience. Eating and drinking are symbolic of an act of will which is mystical communion, an experience in which Christ communicates and man assimilates His life and power. Sacramental Grace is impossible apart from an act of will on the part of one who would receive it. As the symbols expressed the eternally gracious will of God in Jesus, so they made a demand on the emotion and will of the disciples. When they took bread and drank of the cup it was a decisive act, responding to the decisive act of the Master, the answer of the human will to the control, already felt, of the divine will. Thus were the disciples to become conscious of the objective potency of Jesus for their own moral resources. It is Jülicher's failure to realize this which led him to regard the Last Supper as meaningless for Christian Ethics.

Approached as a study in Grace, nothing is more disappointing than Schweitzer's handling of the Lord's Supper. He looks upon it as the last of several 'sealings,' or eschatological sacraments, by means of which the disciples are

[1] Nairne, 51.

assured of a place in the future kingdom when the Son of Man comes in His glory. These eschatological sacraments were guarantees to the disciples that they should survive the calamity attending the inauguration of the new supernatural age. "It is a mistake to regard baptism with water as a 'symbolic act' in the modern sense, and make the Baptist decry his own wares by saying, 'I baptise only with water, but the other can baptise with the Holy Spirit.' He is not contrasting the two baptisms, but connecting them—The object of being baptised by him is to secure baptism with the Spirit later. The forgiveness of sins associated with baptism is proleptic, it is to be realized at the judgment—the baptism of John was, therefore, an eschatological sacrament."[1] Likewise the meal at the Lake of Gennesareth was a veiled eschatological sacrament. Those who received it, however, did not know that it was a sacrament. The Last Supper at Jerusalem had the same significance as that at the Lake; but on this occasion the disciples understood what Jesus meant, for He told them explicitly that He would drink no more of the fruit of the vine until He drank it new in the Kingdom of God. Schweitzer is emphatic that baptism and the Last Supper were sacraments, but he regards them only as an integral part of the apocalyptic movement of which Jesus was the new prophet.

But Schweitzer's guarantees for the individuals in these sacraments are really no more than the guarantees of magic, and magic is spurious religion. How could a sacrament be a guarantee to those who never apprehended that it was a sacrament, as Schweitzer declares to have been the case at the Lake? The objectivity which He ascribes to the sacraments is a false abstraction, for it ignores the believer's appropriation of it, as an act of will, which is symbolized in the taking of the bread and the wine.

Schweitzer is so obsessed by predestinarianism that he has missed the only guarantees to the individual recorded in the Synoptic gospels. These guarantees must be inter-

[1] *Quest of the Hist. Jesus*, 376 ff.

preted through the demand of divine Grace on the human will and whether the will responds. But it is in regard to these demands on the will that Schweitzer fails to do justice to the ethical teaching of Jesus. It is not alone his interim-ethic theory ; by the rigorous application of the principle of determinism he reduces all the ethical teaching of Jesus to mere words. Attention has been drawn to the unethical character attaching to Jewish apocalyptic conceptions of Grace ; and here, Schweitzer can do no better than did the Jewish Apocalyptists. He can only develop his eschatological theory at the expense of the ethic of Jesus. This comes out plainly in his treatment of the Sacraments, and therefore of the Lord's Supper. He fails to see that the symbolic element in the upper room is free action which sets the Will of Jesus as objective to the will of the disciples. And when such symbolism is interpreted through what we know already of the will of Jesus it can only mean that the guarantees for the individual are not abstracted from profound ethical qualities which belong to character, qualities which are due to the control of the Grace of Christ over the human will.

Now our view of the consistency of Christ's will means that the symbols of action in the upper room cover the whole of the historic ministry ; that from His baptism our Lord was the Father's sacrament to all who willed to receive Him. His Grace was consistent. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews traces the development of our Lord's will in the words " He learnt obedience," and it was obedience unto the cross ; but the quality of His obedience as symbolized in the upper room was not different from that at any other period of His ministry. The progress was not due to the external pressure of circumstances, but to the intrinsic character of His own will and motive. So that He was always a living sacrament to faith. In the early days of the ministry men were conscious of receiving His grace in the forgiveness of their sin, and in new moral powers. Sacramental Grace therefore, involving the objective character of Grace and its cost to God on the one hand, and setting forth the objective

demands of Grace on the will of man on the other, was always present in Jesus.

It is not claimed that there was nothing more to be explained concerning Christ and His death. There comes a time when men are driven to interpret their experience, and it came to the disciples. What is claimed is that under the historic conditions of the ministry there were those who were conscious of an experience in which Christ's will and their will were involved. They were not modern introspectionists with a knowledge of themselves as spectators of their own psychical processes. Until the Resurrection they were not in possession of the whole facts. In stating the facts, however, it is amazing how little interpretation the evangelists give. But the facts which are stated magnify the Grace of God to men as sacramental in Jesus.

J. The Resurrection

The synoptic view of our Lord's risen experience raises many critical difficulties. The Second gospel breaks off abruptly, having described no more than the visit of the women to the empty tomb. It reports that the women saw a young man sitting on the right side of the tomb clothed in white ; they saw an angel, says Matthew. The Third gospel narrates that while the women stood inside the tomb, perplexed at the absence of the Lord's body, two men stood by them in dazzling apparel. The First gospel describes the appearance of Jesus to the disciples on the mountain *in Galilee* where He gave His great commission to the eleven. After the visit of the women, Luke adds that Peter ran into the tomb and then departed to his own home, wondering at that which was come to pass ; that on the same day our Lord appeared to two disciples on the way to Emmaus, to Simon and to the eleven, but all these appearances were *in Jerusalem.* On the same evening He appeared to the eleven and delivered His great commission, but commanded them to tarry in Jerusalem until they were clothed with power from on high.

It is at this vital point that the limitation of this Thesis to the Synoptic gospels is seriously felt. The evidence of the synoptists for the Resurrection must always be considered in relation to the early chapters of Acts, and the Epistles of Paul. In a word, evidence for the Resurrection and for the faith of the early Church is of one strand. This does not mean that difficulties of harmonizing available evidence disappear. It does, however, establish the continuous flow of moral activity of which Jesus was the inspiration during the historic ministry.

Garvie thinks that probably in the adaptation of Christ's Grace to the need of the disciples lies the solution of the problems that our fragmentary records leave unsolved.[1] One fact demands reverent attention. Criticism has established beyond reasonable doubt that the author of the Third gospel and Acts was the same person, and that he was the companion of St. Paul. This furnishes the link which holds the evidence together. Whatever difficulties there may be in harmonizing the synoptic evidence, or Luke's gospel and the forty days' interval between the Resurrection and the Ascension in the Acts, it is unlikely that Luke would write a history which was inconsistent with itself. Thompson admits that we get a surprising consensus of evidence throughout the gospels for the two crucial appearances, one to Peter, the other to the eleven.[2]

Mark gives no explanation of the event of the Resurrection beyond claiming that Jesus had kept His word.

The angel in Matthew says to the women, "He is not here, for He is risen, even as He said." Then follows the appearance of Jesus to the women and His message to them for the disciples. He does not explain His Resurrection to the eleven. He claims that all authority has been given to Him in heaven and on earth. In virtue of this authority He sends them to continue His work on the earth and to teach what He had commanded them.

This can only refer to the instruction of pre-crucifixion

[1] *Inner Life*, 437. [2] *Miracles of New Testament*, 200.

days. His Grace and His Ethic were to form the substance and content of their message. The closing words of the Gospel abound in Grace. They imply what His Gracious Presence had been in the days of the Ministry, and they promise the Grace of that Presence even to the end.

Luke is explicit that the women entered into the tomb and found not the body. The explanation is that He had risen, as He said, when He was yet in Galilee. Each evangelist sees that in rising again our Lord had kept His word.

The Emmaus experience confirms the evidence of the women and Peter for the empty tomb. Our Lord again explains the necessity of His sufferings, and their relation to His entrance into Glory. It must be remembered that what is recorded concerning the necessity of our Lord's passion *is inseparable from the necessity of His Resurrection.* In Mark 8. 31 ; 9. 31, He speaks of His Resurrection as an act of His will. Such words surely form the basis of the Johannine sentence, "therefore doth my Father love Me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again."[1]

The Grace of Jesus is seen in the assurance which He brought to the hearts of the eleven.[2] He convinces them of His identity. The tumult of their emotion could not better be described than by Luke, that they disbelieved for joy and wondered. He recalled to them His words on the necessity of His Resurrection and then proceeded to open their mind, a wondrous act of Grace, that they might understand the Scriptures. The final purpose of His death and Resurrection was, He shewed, that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name. He promised the gift of power from above, all that is comprehended in the gracious access of the Holy Spirit. And conscious of divine Grace as the mightiest energy working in and through them, they were to bear witness of the things which they themselves had seen and heard.

[1] John 10. 17 f. [2] *Inner Life*, 437.

CHAPTER II

THE QUEST, THE APPEAL, THE WELCOME OF GOD'S GRACE IN JESUS

A. The Quest of Grace

1. *The Preacher of Grace*

Mark 1. 38; *Luke* 4. 43

WE have seen that our Lord was conscious of having been anointed to preach good-tidings. All things had been delivered unto Him by the Father, His message of Grace included. This is the first sentence in the Marcan cycle which states our Lord's consciousness of *being sent* to preach the Gospel. "For to this end came I forth." The meaning of this declaration is not exhausted by reference to the exodus from Capernaum to preach in other cities. The immediate intention to preach in other parts must be included in the more comprehensive purpose of His life. Unless we are to dismiss the evidence of Luke, we must admit that Christ was conscious of being in the present world for the specific mission of preaching good-tidings. There is an urgency and necessity in the Third gospel which allows of no other interpretation: "I *must* preach the good-tidings of the Kingdom of God to the other cities also, for therefore was I sent." Such a passage pulsates with the energy of the Grace of God, prompting Jesus to go from city to city in quest of sinful men. From this utterance onwards Jesus never shews the slightest hesitation concerning the ultimate motive of His Presence in the world. He knew that He had been sent on a gracious quest.

2. *The Quest for Sinners*

Mark 2. 15–17; *Matt.* 9. 10–13; *Luke* 5. 29–32

Each evangelist relates the feast in the house. We have seen that on such matters as His authority, often as it affected Jewish institutions, our Lord came into collision with the Hierarchy. His doctrine of God and man, and their relation, incarnated in His *action*, afforded another ground of annoyance. He had already forgiven the sins of the paralytic, and had proceeded to approach irreligious men in God's name, manifesting in His unique activity the quest of Grace. The personal approach of God to man, and of man to God—an experience which Jesus assumed to be the resultant of His quest—was an experience which revolutionized the legalistic views of divine and human relations. If such personal experience were real, it was seen clearly enough that divine-human relations were no longer regulated by the Jewish Church.

Without variation each evangelist records the motive of our Lord's quest: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." The object of associating with such men was to convince them of the hunger of divine Grace for their penitence and fellowship. These outcasts of the Jewish Church had ceased to contemplate any approach to God as possible from their side. To conceive God as approaching them was more remote still. When Jesus, knowing that He had been sent, sought them in the name of God they were conscious of the compassion of divine Grace Personalized in Him. Abandoned they might be, but they had sight for what the Legalists missed—that the holiness of Jesus did not exclude His gracious quest for their fellowship.

In the attitude of the Nomists to the publicans and sinners we perceive the wideness of the gulf between the two classes in Israel in our Lord's day. We shall see that Jesus had no hope of reconciling them except on a common evangelical and ethical basis. His despair of the unintentional

sinners on this occasion is seen in His intuition of their estimate of themselves as 'whole,' and needing no physician. Our Lord was not given to sarcasm ; but it is impossible to see in His words any other meaning than a scathing judgment on the legal relations of God and man. Opposition between Himself and the Jewish leaders always arose from some act or claim on His part to effect a totally different divine-human relationship. On this occasion Jesus used the word 'whole' to express the view of the Legalists that Judaism was a perfected religious system. The authority of the Torah was regarded as pre-existent and final : no one could deduct from it nor add to it : it contained the last word on God's approach to man, or man's approach to God. Such perfected legal safeguards afforded Christ no ground of appeal, for Judaism was a closed system and complete without Him. The First evangelist is conscious of this, for he quotes from Hosea, pointing out that the Legalists had not learnt that Jahweh desired *ḥesedh* at their hands ;[1] in eating and drinking with publicans and sinners, it was divine *ḥesedh* which Jesus revealed.

3. *Parables of Lost Sheep and Coin*

Luke 15. 1–7, 8–10 ; *Matt.* 18. 12–14

In these parables our Lord explains and vindicates His motive and methods of work. "The Pharisees and Scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them." Were Jesus the Messiah they assumed that His aims and activities would coincide with their own. On the other hand, were the Legalists, as they claimed to be, the neighbours of God, Christ assumed that they would rejoice and not murmur at the repentance and return of the lost.

The Grace of God is revealed in the value which these parables set upon man as man. To Jesus, human life was of inestimable value since it was a divine gift. However aban-

[1] Matt. 9. 13.

doned the individual was, Christ taught that he was incomparably precious to the Father. He shews that God could not be indifferent to depraved men. The nature of His eternal motive made, and still makes, such indifference impossible. This view is accented further in our Lord's suggestion that God is the rightful owner of that which is lost. Whatever value the individual had received before this period, it was Jesus who first revealed to him his intrinsic worth to God. The contempt of the Legalists for publicans and sinners indicates their values of man as man. It must be pointed out that the ninety-and-nine were not necessarily the Legalists, dwelling safely in the fold, for whom no quest was necessary. The use of numbers in these parables has no other aim than to establish the ultimate significance of the individual for God. They indicate that human revaluation which was manifested through the Master's gracious quest.

Both within and without Israel, considerable progress had been made from the tribal view of the individual to a sense of his personal responsibility. Jeremiah was the first to proclaim a new value of the individual *within* Israel. His teaching, followed by that of Ezekiel, contained the germ of universalism, which was capable of shewing the inherent worth of the individual as such, through his spiritual relation to Jahweh. The teaching of these prophets, however, never really progressed beyond a particularistic setting. The Sinaitic covenant was made with the nation, and Jeremiah's views of the individual were no more than " a change of stress, not of contents. . . . It has been held that Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant was making Christianity possible. But he was also making Judaism possible . . . the new covenant is specifically made with the house of Judah and of Israel, and it is associated with the permanence of the seed of Israel as a separate people."[1] That is, the same exclusive significance was attached to the Jew as an individual that had been attached to the nation. Not even Deutero-Isaiah, where, with the exception of the Book of Jonah, the Messianic

[1] Abrahams, *Judaism*, 9 f.

mission of Israel to the world is most definitely stated, draws an acceptable conclusion concerning the individual as such. Jahweh addresses Cyrus as His shepherd,[1] but he has no intrinsic value to God : He takes hold of this Gentile warrior as a man takes hold of a tool. He is without worth to God except as the most potent political force of that time, capable of effecting the redemption of Israel from Babylon. And Cyrus may be regarded as the final estimate of Deutero-Isaiah concerning the value of the heathen individual to God.[2]

From the time of the reformation under Ezra and Nehemiah, with its repudiation of mixed marriages, all distinctions between Jew and non-Jew were sharpened, until the Gentile had no significance to God except through Jewish mediation. The apocalyptic theology as explained in the Introduction shews how Judaism despaired of the Gentile world, and could find no other solution than its necessary destruction at the hands of God. Schechter goes so far as to say that it is not the highest aim of Judaism to satisfy the needs of anybody and everybody : " nor is the individual—the pet of modern theology—with his heart-burnings and mystical longings, of sufficient importance that Judaism can spend its whole strength on him."[3]

Now the difference between our Lord's estimate of the individual and that of the Legalists was such as to evoke the bitterest complaints from the latter. In the light of such a fact, it is surely mistaken to say that our Lord accepted the Jewish Doctrine of Man or made no advances upon it. Can we account for these synoptic discussions and parables on any other hypothesis than that Judaism realized a disintegrating force at work in its midst, and set itself to counteract such force with all the resources at its command ? This continual antagonism is not something written up in the interests of humanizing the cult of the saviour-god. We have to account for more than the parts assigned to Jesus. We must explain the anxiety which Judaism is always manifesting for its own

[1] Isa. 44. 28. [2] G. A. Smith, *Isa.*, Vol. II, 162 f.
[3] *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, 77.

welfare, and we can do so on this occasion only as we conclude that the Jewish Church fiercely resented the estimate which Jesus set upon the individual, at the cost of legalistic doctrine and practice.

The Grace of God inspired the will of Jesus to seek the soul which had such intrinsic worth, but was lost. Luke's statement is emphatic : " He goes after that which is lost until He finds it." The value of the soul that is lost is magnified through the quest of our Lord's Grace. The Legalists were incapable of seeing the relation of God and man and themselves under this aspect. For Jesus assumed that all men were lost, the Legalists included. If the language of *these parables* is pressed, it suggests that those who are lost are unconscious of the nature of their peril until they are found. Jesus is speaking from the standpoint of God, who knows what He has lost, and whose only motive is to seek until He finds. The stress in these parables lies on the divine initiative in the salvation of the soul. The man who is lost does not find himself, he is found. In the Christian Religion the emphasis is on the divine quest for man, not the quest of man for God. God is the seeker, and these parables affirm the restlessness of His Grace in Christ, until that which was lost is found.

4. *Zacchæus*

Luke 19. 1–10

The experience of Zacchæus illustrates all that is vital in the parables which have been discussed. He was a publican and a sinner, and lost. He is, therefore, a type of those whom the Son of Man came to seek and to save. Zacchæus was an Israelite, but one of those who was excluded from the Jewish Church. He was an intentional sinner who had thrust himself beyond the reach of the Grace of God. The Legalists murmured that Jesus should go in and lodge with such a character ; but Jesus stated His motive for lodging with Zacchæus to be no other than His gracious quest for that

which was lost. What conversation passed during the night in the house of the tax-gatherer we are not told, but we know that Jesus convinced Zacchæus that He had come into the world to seek and to save such men as he was. And as the Grace of God in Jesus became objectively clear to the mind of this publican, he accepted it, and it wrought within him a new ethical dynamic and ideal.

B. The Appeal of Grace

1. *The Gracious Invitation*

Matt. 11. 28–30

It is usual with some critics to compare this passage with the closing prayer in Ecclesiasticus.[1] There are several verbal agreements which suggest our Lord's acquaintance with the older work. All other evidence, textual or theological, points to Jesus as the author of this gracious invitation. Pfleiderer contends that this logion is composed by the evangelist, and is based on the prayer of Jesus, Son of Sirach. The Thanksgiving Prayer was said to be a reading back of the "dogmatic idea of a unique metaphysical relation of the son to the father into the self-consciousness of the historical Jesus."[2] That Jesus had such a consclousness is said to be historically unthinkable. The same author regards the gracious invitation as a reading forward of Ben Sira into the same self-consciousness. This argument is thought to be strengthened since the appeal of Jesus is arranged to follow His prayer, as is the case in the older source. Such a method of criticism is as ingenious as it is necessary to the philosophic theory which it serves. The only evidence to hand is that Jesus uttered this logion ; and when these words are interpreted through the ultimate motive of our Lord, it is seen that they could have been uttered by no other.

[1] 51. 23–30. [2] *Christian Origins*, 232.

To discover verbal parallels between different sources is not to prove dependence of one source on another. What scientific method is there in eliminating the differences in order to explain the agreements ? There are profound differences between this invitation in the First gospel and that of Ben Sira, and they cannot be explained apart from the unique quest of Christ. In some respects, these words go beyond the kindly attitude to the Torah which is characteristic of the First gospel. At any rate, they are as far removed from Ben Sira's appeal in the name of Wisdom as the East is from the West.

The respective passages will serve to point out the marked contrast between our Lord's gracious appeal and that of Ben Sira. The latter assumes and explicitly declares the existence of the two classes within Judaism—the wise and the foolish, corresponding to unintentional and intentional sinners. At the close of his book he makes one of those rare appeals in Jewish literature to the foolish class. It is inconsistent with the whole tenor of his teaching, for earlier in his book he says the two classes and their destiny are predetermined in the counsels of God.[1] As a whole, the Wisdom Literature holds out no hope whatever to the fool—he was one who sinned with a high hand. Moreover, the exclusive character of Ben Sira's appeal is beyond question. The 'unlearned' are the fools, men born within the sacred covenant-relation who had repudiated their own birthright. On the other hand, Jesus appeals to the learned who labour —those who possessed already the wisdom which was magnified by Ben Sira. The latter calls to men who have never laboured, nor put their necks to the yoke of the law.[2] Jesus calls those who labour and are burdened with the Torah yoke to accept His yoke instead. In other words, the wisdom of Ben Sira was a labour, a burden, from which Jesus came to relieve men. The First evangelist realized that the invitation of Jesus was to the wise, from whom were hidden the things the Father had revealed to babes. Whether his juxtaposition

[1] 33. 11–15 ; cf. Intro., 26. [2] 51. 26.

of the Great Thanksgiving and the Great Invitation is due to his method of grouping or not, he has no doubt that the Grace of the Father is revealed to the 'foolish,' and that the invitation of Jesus is to the Legalists who were burdened with their wisdom.[1]

The significant feature of this passage is our Lord's consciousness that He occupied the position which His hearers had been accustomed to give to the Law. He assumes that He has authority to cancel the unique position which the Law had occupied in the relations of God and man. He called men to turn from a yoke which neither they nor their fathers had been able to bear, to a personal fellowship with Himself. There can be no doubt that Jesus saw legalism as a load which crushed men, and that He offered them His Grace as an inspiration to meekness and lowliness of heart.

Our Lord's Grace is known in His gift of rest-experience. Ben Sira had obtained much rest by a little labour. Jesus offers rest which cannot be won. In the latter case it is rest by Grace, in the former it is rest by merit. It is quite probable that Jesus was appealing to the restless spirits in Judaism who are represented in IV Ezra, and who realized the inadequacy of the Law to achieve national redemption. The rest, however, which was so graciously offered to these souls, was a new relationship with God through Christ.

2. *The Great Supper and the Marriage of the King's Son*

Matt. 22. 1–10 ; *Luke* 14. 15–24

It will be convenient to discuss these parables together. Differences of detail suggest that they were uttered on separate occasions, but both teach the same truth. In Luke, a certain man made a Great Supper : in Matthew, the King made a Marriage Feast for his son. Luke records two invitations to the Jews, Matthew three. In the Third gospel the

[1] cf. Luke 11. 46.

servants are unmolested: in the First, they are treated shamefully and killed. In Luke no judgment is meted out to those who refuse the Supper: according to Matthew they are destroyed and their city burnt. These differences have led some to question the historicity of the Matthean parable. It is suggested that the evangelist was accounting for the rejection and fate of the Jews, and the call of the Gentiles. This view admits the Gracious Invitation in the parable, but assumes that it is there through the influence of Paul. If the simplest statement of a truth is its first and not its last phase, then these parables are the basis and not the result of Paul's teaching on Grace.

These parables point out that men are invited to that which God Himself has prepared. This is the underlying assumption of the New Testament throughout, and it receives the most explicit utterance here and elsewhere in the teaching of Jesus. The objective character of the Grace of God is the basis of our Lord's appeal. Such goodness is as objective to the human soul as a supper to the human appetite. It is as real as the meal which one person prepares for another. "Thou preparest a table before Me." Further, that which God has provided for man, and to which He invites him, is not something which man possesses already. Judaism did not possess it. The ethnic idea of a meal to which man invites God is completely reversed in these parables. And there can be no doubt that the objective reality to which men are invited in these parables is the Grace of God as centred in Jesus. This is confirmed by the invitation to Himself in Matthew 11. 28 f.

Another feature in the parables is the scope of the Gracious Invitation. The Jews are invited and refuse; then the publicans and sinners from the streets and lanes in the city; then the Gentiles from the highways and hedges. The urgency and the munificence of the Grace of God are also set out clearly. If these parables must receive a thoroughgoing eschatological interpretation, they present the appeal of divine Grace in a manner which transcends all Jewish thought.

The freedom and scope of divine Grace which they unfold are essentially the revelation of Jesus.

C. The Welcome of Grace

1. *Parable of the Gracious Father*

Luke 15. 11–32

The supreme instance of Grace as objective is set forth in this parable of the Gracious Father. Both sons are Jewish: one is orthodox and righteous, the other forfeits every privilege which once was his. In demanding and spending his portion he exhausted every vestige of a claim to sonship. Both sons recognize this. The climax of the parable is the Father's Gracious welcome on the return of the younger son. This involves an attempt by the Father to reconcile the two brothers. He proceeded to convince the elder that his welcome to the younger was right in itself and violated no principles of justice as far as he, the elder son, was concerned. The parable concludes by shewing that the Grace of God is never unethical.

This parable is the complement of the two which precede it. On the present occasion Jesus introduces the human will as a factor to be reckoned with. It must be remembered that Jesus affirms a primary relationship between Father and son. It is a son who demands his freedom and his inheritance. This fact, presupposed at the outset, is never lost to sight. Jesus never abstracts the human from the divine. Father and son are correlative terms involving the Father's responsibility for the existence of the Son. This is in keeping with the Jewish view of the covenant, in the rights of which both sons share. Nor is the correlation obliterated in the Father when the son is lost. His anticipation and emotion reveal how conscious He was of the absence of His son. Now it is through these correlated terms that we must interpret the son's repentance and return and welcome. This is not a nice philosophical question.

True to the tenor of His whole teaching Jesus deals with personalities, all free to act, none being determined in the interests of any theory. The son is an intentional sinner who has legally thrust himself beyond the limits of divine Grace. He was legally dead, as one who had sinned against the Father with a high hand. But the point to grasp is, that our Lord sweeps away the false distinction which Judaism had established between the intentional and the unintentional sinner, and shews that the Grace of the Father *always* welcomes the penitent. By His Grace the Father can cause the legally dead to live again and restore such a one to sonship.

Then, how came the lost son to return? Jesus entered into no lengthy explanation concerning any theory of sin. He simply says, "He came to himself." The motives of the lost son are not equal. One aspiration was to escape his poverty, which the modern mind would have expected him to bear with fortitude, only it might be asked, where is the soul that is able to bear all its deserts? We know that the son had arrived at a new sense of responsibility. It was something to be convinced that he had sinned in His Father's sight, and to be content to fill the rank of a hired servant. His motive was mainly influenced through the slow awakening concerning the reality of that which he had lost. There was that in his relation to his Father which was deeper than his poverty and sin and was capable of surviving both. As this consciousness deepened it shaped his resolution, and gave rise to penitence; but such was the nature of his experience that in his deepest degradation the lost son could speak of 'my Father.' Because of the strength of this filial conviction it never occurred to him that his Father would disown him altogether. Not that the prodigal expected what he received. It is the purpose of Jesus to contrast what he thought he might receive with what he did receive. To become a hired servant would be better than he deserved—even that would be an act of Grace, the highest conception of Grace of which the prodigal was capable.

The reception of the Father overwhelmed the son. His anticipation and compassion, His race to meet him, His tokens of endearment, are drawn by the hand of Him who knew that He was not exaggerating the Grace of God's welcome to sinful men. As far as language can be put to use, this parable is the last word on the unfathomable Grace of God. The quest and appeal of God for the lost is only transcended by His gracious welcome when the lost returns.

The Grace of the divine welcome is the central thing in the parable, and Jesus deliberately made it so. Its stupendous meaning for those who heard it lay in its revelation of the objective character of the Grace of the Father, who welcomed sinners. Further, the reception was such an event as to produce great joy: "let us eat and make merry." Such an experience as the welcome of the penitent was an occasion for rejoicing on the part of the angels in heaven; but the Grace which led to such exultation in the Father's household swept the Legalists' doctrine of merit to the winds, and they knew that it did so.

Still, this parable is an appeal to the Legalists. Nothing could be further from the mark than the alleged 'tendency' of Luke to write these parables in the interests of Paulinism. Pfleiderer says the obverse of Luke's friendship for the heathen "is the Jew-hatred of this heathen-Christian evangelist."[1] But the parables and incidents which are peculiar to Luke, and are often regarded as having been written to gratify his Gentile sympathies, contain some of the most powerful appeals to the Jews. They never reveal Jew-hatred. Zacchæus was a Jew. So are the two sons in the parable under consideration. The Jews are urgently invited to the Great Supper. And at the close of the present parable Jesus attempts to convince the Jews that the Grace of God to sinners was not unjust to them. The elder son is angry at his Father's reception of the younger, an out-

[1] *Origins*, 235; cf. Moffatt, *I. N. T. L.*, 281: "One of the most assured results of recent research is that he was not a Paulinist masquerading as an historian."

burst of emotion which reflects the indignation and murmuring of the Pharisees at the fellowship of Jesus with outcasts. And when the Father entreats the elder son, it is the appeal of our Lord to the Legalists to enter into the realization of the joy of the divine Grace. Further, the answer and refusal of the elder son suggest a similar motive to that of the wicked husbandmen, who wished to keep the inheritance for themselves. The elder son grudged the younger any place in his Father's house. He is the typical Legalist, deaf to the Father's appeal, and refusing to be reconciled to his brother.

2. *The Pharisee and the Publican*

Luke 18. 9–14

The story of the Pharisee and the publican illustrates the same gracious welcome of the penitent as was the case with the lost son. The merit and satisfaction of the Pharisee are strongly contrasted with the demerit and humility of the publican. The former acts as one for whom every religious pose is regulated. The latter acts under the inspiration of the objective Grace of God and His power to forgive. In saying that this man went down to his house justified rather than the other, Luke used a Pauline word. It suggests, however, the synoptic view of Grace as forgiveness, rather than the Pauline doctrine of justification through faith in the death of Christ.

3. *The Dying Malefactor*

Luke 23. 39–43

What our Lord accomplished in the house of Zacchæus as evidence that He had come to seek and to save that which was lost, so He accomplished on the cross with the dying malefactor, as evidence of His teaching of the welcome in the Parable of the Gracious Father. It was part of the Jewish doctrine of Grace that God was able to reward the

pious individual even in the hour of death, and with such compensations as atoned for life-long suffering. The present instance is unique in the synoptic doctrine of Grace, for the robber was a terrible and high-handed sinner. The dark deeds which lay to the malefactor's record ; their weight on his conscience, growing heavier as life ebbed away ; the comparison of his own merited suffering with Christ's innocence ; the penitent appeal to Jesus, who in His passion had prayed for the forgiveness of His murderers ; the aspiration which arose from the malefactor's conviction of sin and his knowledge of Jesus ; the gracious, immediate welcome of the penitent in the hour of death, and the promise of a future fellowship in eternal blessedness ; this experience is such an objective manifestation of the Grace of God in Jesus that we stand silent before its unfathomable reality. Our Lord's authority to forgive sins on the earth ; to seek and save and welcome the most depraved of men in the name of God, is magnified on the cross. It was out of an experience, equally vivid in its way, that Paul was led to exalt the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God, and to praise the glory of the Grace which He freely bestowed on us in the Beloved ; in whom we have our redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of His Grace.

" In this wicked man a striking mirror of the unexpected and incredible Grace of God is held out to us, not only in his being suddenly changed into a new man, when he was near death, and drawn from hell itself into heaven, but likewise in having obtained in a moment the forgiveness of all the sins in which he had been plunged through his whole life. . . . A remarkable instance of the Grace of God shines in the conversion of that man. For it was not by the natural movement of the flesh that he laid aside his fierce cruelty and proud contempt of God, so as to repent immediately, but he was subdued by the hand of God. . . . And so much more excellent is this Grace that it came beyond the expectation of all . . . with a mangled body, and almost

dead . . . he relies on the Grace of Christ alone. . . . This reminds us that we ought not to judge of the Grace of God by the perception of the flesh." And we are convinced that Calvin's diagnosis of this experience, masculine and full of insight, is true to Christian experience of divine Grace.[1]

D. Summary

Frequent attention has been drawn to the antagonism which our Lord's doctrine of Grace evoked. The motive of the elder brother's refusal to be reconciled to the younger is the clue to this conflict. He regarded the welcome of the younger son to be a negation of justice, most of all an injustice to himself. The Father replied that his action was *right*. The same argument is used by the labourers in the vineyard who agreed for a penny a day.[2] They complained that the householder's rewards were unequal and unjust to themselves. Again, the householder replied that his rewards did them *no wrong*. It did not lie within the scope of his gracious will to do that which was unlawful. His will was good, and the alleged injustice to themselves was attributed to their evil eye. The parable reveals how the Legalists totally misjudged the relation of Grace and motive, both in God and men.

Now what is this but the old and new problem of reconciling science and Grace. The Jewish Legalists were as emphatic in their repudiation of Christ's doctrine of Grace as the most thoroughgoing Legalist of modern days. Judaism worked with a theory of merit which was as perfect as any scientific system could be that dealt with human action. Modern attempts at a Science of Ethics are mere child's play compared with Judaism. Of course, the Jewish and the modern evolutionist's ethical sanctions are not the same. But Christ's doctrine of Grace seemed as impossible and as unjust to religious Legalists as it does to the natural Legalists

[1] Calvin's *Commentary, in loco.* [2] Matt. 20. 1–16.

of to-day. It was, and is, the greatest challenge offered to any kind of legalism. That challenge was not allowed to pass in our Lord's day on the earth, any more than at the present time. Judaism denied the justice of the Grace of God as revealed by Jesus. The Father replied to the elder son that His gracious welcome was intrinsically just (*v.* 32). The failure of religious legalism to reconcile divine Grace in Christ with the justice of God, was due to its exclusive theory of man (that a Gentile had no hope), just as the failure of modern science has been due to its exclusion of God's Freedom. Against legalism, either ancient or modern, our Lord claims to forgive sins. He is not concerned with subtle philosophical points which such a claim raises. He rests His claim in the reality of the divine Will to effect the sinner's experience of His Grace. This test is quite as effective now as in the days of His flesh, and as adequate an answer to modern legalism as it was to the Pharisees and scribes.

CHAPTER III

GRACE AND THE MIRACLES

WE have seen that Jesus was conscious of an objective control—nothing less than the will of His Father to save mankind. What relation does this will bear to the miracles in the Synoptic gospels? Since this method of approaching the miracles has been challenged by modern writers, and may seem to take too much for granted, it will be well to understand the points at issue.

A. Grace and History

The critics who hold that Jesus lived a purely human life, thereby deny the miraculous power assigned to Him in the gospels. Adopting the historical method of enquiry they conclude that the miracles did not happen. But the fundamental principle of the scientific-historic method is, that miracles cannot happen—that nothing can violate the immanent causal nexus. Clearly, this is a presupposition which begs the whole question of the objective reality of the Grace of God in Jesus. But we believe that reality often eludes the mind which is obsessed by method. History is but one science, and like every other science, it studies reality from a particular point of view: there are ultimate problems which by its own principle it cannot settle. The task of the historian is to sift evidence and say what occurred. That such a task bristles with difficulties no one will deny. The geologist can dwell at ease with his material; for all practical

purposes he observes an object over which the human will has no control. Many other investigators are in the same position. But history is never free from the psychological processes which make it, and write it, and interpret it. Yet, the science of history assumes that the same method which accounts for geological processes will explain human events. Hume says that miracles are contrary to experience ; but he is committed to the conclusion that personality is contrary to experience. His modern followers retain personality, but when dealing with history, they attempt to precipitate its qualities, as though they were chemical elements. The evolution of the earth's formation is that of intrinsic adaptation. On the other hand, the motive which lies behind history transcends the event in which it embodies itself. This means that Personality creates history and is the only clue to its meaning.

This is frequently ignored or denied in synoptic criticism. The miracles are segregated from the rest of the gospel narrative, until nothing remains but the bare statement of the event. Thompson[1] abstracts the subjective from the objective, and then concludes that the ' wonders ' did not happen as related, nor had the ministry of healing anything miraculous about it. For objective purposes, the shewing of the holy coat at Trèves is quite as effective as the Personality of Jesus in the Synoptic gospels. In both cases it is the subject's own faith in himself which works the cure. This is the result of the historical method of enquiry. Our Lord's Personality is denuded of all transcendent significance for the interpretation of the miracles or anything else.

The same writer points out that the miracles attributed to Jesus belong to the early enthusiastic days of the Galilean ministry. They " originated in the devotion of the crowd and they were perpetuated by the tradition of the apostolic circle."[2] He then estimates the evidence of the two-document theory : Mark's " evidence of the works of healing is good evidence, but it is not evidence for miracles."[3] Q's evidence

[1] *Miracles of New Testament.* [2] 42. [3] 41.

for the works of healing is also good but "free from all miraculous elements." Thompson's assessment of Luke is amazing; he is sadly disappointed that Luke agrees with Mark concerning the miraculous element in the Gospels. Luke is said to come short of the promise of accuracy in his prologue, and "we cannot take it on its own valuation."[1] Luke's motive in representing Jesus as the Saviour and Healer of soul and body for all the world [2] makes him a less trustworthy witness to the facts of the Gospel than Mark himself.[3]

Thompson argues for the non-miraculous nature of Q. He has a great weight of opinion against him. Harnack assigns the incidents of the centurion's servant, and the blind and dumb demoniac to Q. B. Weiss says that Q. records thirteen miracles, including works of healing such as the paralytic of Mark 2. 1–12; also wonders, such as the stilling of the tempest (Mark 4. 35–41). Lake thinks that every year after 50 A.D. is increasingly "improbable for the production of Q."[4] Hence, the value of the testimony of Q. for the miracles of Jesus is not to be dismissed as lightly as Thompson assumes. Every strand of synoptic tradition is evidence for the miracles of Jesus.

B. Grace and Metaphysics

The historical method illustrated above is really the application of a metaphysical presupposition which is fatal to any Doctrine of Grace. For instance, Bousset argues that Jesus' conception of the Transcendence of God is no longer possible,[5] a conclusion which rests on the philosophical method which has always, in one form or another, sacrificed the interests of the particular to the universal. Apart from its denial of Transcendence, Pantheism cannot admit of miracles, because it cannot admit the reality of the individual.

[1] *Ibid.*, 79. [2] 93. [3] 87.
[4] *Expositor*, June, 1907.
[5] *Jesus*. See chapter on "Jesus' Conception of God."

It is on the latter issue that Wendland's[1] argument is found wanting. It is his failure at this point which vitiates his attempt to maintain the Doctrine of Divine Transcendence. As a philosopher, he makes a sound claim for miracle, and therefore for the freedom of God's Grace, but he fails to reconcile his claim with science and history. He bases his argument for miracle on the existence of the Living God, and this leads him to regard every event as miraculous. God is always creating that which is new without breaking the immanent causal nexus. He reasons that we do not understand any natural event in the universe since every event is miraculous. At the same time he concludes that "the idea of miracle must not be forced on either science or history."[2] Wendland ends where Thompson does. The feeding of the multitudes and the raising of the dead are something of which we have no experience ourselves : "Hence it must remain doubtful whether God has ever wrought events of such a kind in the course of redeeming history."[3]

Wendland makes a noble attempt to conserve the influx of transcendent energy into human experience, a vital point for the Christian Doctrine of Grace ; but when we apply his argument to the synoptic miracles we find that it does not bear the strain. From the divine point of view, he says all is miracle. From the human point of view, the synoptic testimony for miracles is to be doubted since it is evidence which must not be forced on history. The difficulty lies in his metaphysical principle which refuses to admit that the individual mind has contact with reality. Yet, this is exactly what the evangelists claim. To say that if we knew all, all would be miracle, and then add that such a view must not be pressed upon history, implies some serious defect in the theory of knowledge upon which such arguments rest. Now, miracle in the Synoptic gospels is not regarded as an experience which knowledge will one day correct *sub specie æternitas*. Too often miracle is linked with mystery or ignorance. To say that one day, through increasing knowledge, the miraculous

[1] *Christianity and Miracles*, 15. [2] p. 20. [3] p. 228.

will appear as the normal, is to commit the old fallacy of distinguishing between phenomena and noumena. The evangelists relate experience *in which a claim is made for immediate contact with reality in the present world.* The motive of Jesus was real, the individual's experience, due to that motive, was also real; and the knowledge of such reality was not something that would pass away, or be corrected later. It was an experience of Grace which was eternally true.

Further, it has been suggested that Jesus was acquainted with, and used the laws of, modern psycho-therapeutics. That may have been so, but psycho-therapeutics apart from the Personality of Jesus could never explain the synoptic miracles. In this case everything turns on the nature of Personality, not on this or that method. And the Person "who could rejuvenate at a word a strand of atrophied nerve, might bring about the wasting of a fig-tree in a moment; and it would be rash to say that He might not command the winds and the waves or raise the dead to life."[1] The synoptists regarded nature as open to God in the sense in which Wendland uses the term; but they go further. They claim that the works of Jesus were such as no other man did. Nor did they understand by miracle a natural wonder. They set miracle in the heart of spiritual experience. And if the metaphysical view of miracle stumbles at such reality as is claimed by the evangelists, and gets no further than the science of history, it is because the synoptists furnish experience which transcends them both.

C. The Universe of Miraculous Experience

The miracles of the Synoptic gospels belong to a universe of experience which cannot be explained on principles other than its own. It is a realm of experience in which God and man are free to act, and in which the divine Will initiates.

[1] R. J. Ryle, M.D., *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1907. See *Immortality* (edited by Canon Streeter), ch. ii.

It is not a universe where any attempt is made to balance spirit and matter. The synoptists describe events in which the most stupendous reality is the divine motive, seen in the operation of the Will of Jesus. It is the Grace of God prompting His Will which explains miraculous experience on its objective side.

In this connection the synoptic Doctrine of Man should not be lost to sight. Jesus had a view of the relation of God, man, and nature, in which the only opposition of which He was conscious was an opposition to divine Grace. That was sin. For our Lord such a thing as a dualism of mind and body did not exist. The psychical and physical were alike objects of His redemption. The only antagonism in the Universe that Jesus knew was that between Grace and sin. The whole matter, from the standpoint of Jesus, is summed up in His judgment on Jerusalem: "How often would I . . . and ye would not."

Again, the synoptists never abstract the human will from the body. Nor could anything be clearer than that they assume the body to come within the scope and operation of the divine Will. Many who deny the miracles of Jesus do so through the influence of some Pantheistic or Akosmistic theory, which knows nothing of the New Testament doctrine of the redemption of the body. The body is vital to the New Testament conception of personality; and it is worth noting that nothing in modern psycho-therapeutics would contradict the New Testament.

The real issue, then, is not between Jesus and the human body, it is always presented as between Jesus and the human will. This issue has the utmost consequences for the destiny of human personality.[1] Now the central appeal of the Grace of God in Jesus is to the Will, and in the miracles this is manifested in the significance which is attached to faith. The evangelists always present faith in Jesus as an act of Will, "a basal energy of the whole man," which makes demands upon its own object, namely, Jesus. Under such

[1] Matt. 10. 28.

objective control, faith creates a subjective condition through and in which the will of Jesus operates in the whole man.

The miracles must, therefore, be considered in relation to our Lord's teaching on faith and prayer. Both are fellowship with God, and as such, God's opportunity with man. There are several instances of vicarious faith in the Gospels. But whether faith is an act of the sufferer, or of others on his behalf, or of both operating simultaneously, it is the opportunity for the Will of Jesus. The condition denoted by the words 'faith in Jesus,' therefore, contains potentially the objective and subjective aspects of miraculous experience. In such a case, faith and prayer on the part of man are evoked and controlled by Christ as object. Jesus could do no mighty works in Nazareth because this condition was absent. Miracle in human life is necessarily an experience where wills interact and where the Will of Jesus is unique in moral goodness and power. It is this Holy Grace in Jesus, leading Him to forgive sins, as well as heal the body, that carries psycho-therapeutics out of their depth. Such Grace sets Him apart as creative of miraculous experience in which the whole man shares. And when the will of man closed with the will of Jesus, our *Lord never failed.*[1] On every such occasion we see what Mozley calls 'standing,' but what we prefer to call 'volitional,' "miraculous power lodged in a person."[2]

D. Miracles as Part of Our Lord's Ethic

The miracles are sometimes discounted by saying that our Lord never treated them as evidence for His Messiahship. Not infrequently attenuated views of His Messiahship, amounting to a denial of the same, lie behind this statement.

1. Our Lord's response to His Father's Will was so complete that He was the objective manifestation of that Will to

[1] Bousset thinks that Matt. 12. 43–45 was probably a case of failure. *Jesus*, 50.

[2] *Bampton Lectures on Miracles*, 168.

others. We have seen at what cost to Himself, and how through suffering and prayer with His strong crying and tears, He perfectly embodied His Father's Will in His own Personality. The evangelists shew that in our Lord's life and teaching prayer has the utmost significance for the relation of His Grace to His Ethic. It was through His prayer-experience which was His normal experience that He transmuted the Grace of the Father into moral energies. And it seems to the present writer that the putting forth of our Lord's will, so that He effected the healing of mind and body, must be related to His prayer-life, and in that case the miracles must be regarded as belonging to His Ethic. They are acts of Grace, moral acts, and they are the effects of the prayer-life of our Lord. They are *achievements* of His Will. They belong to the 'ought' of His gracious mission. They are certainly to be included in such words as 'He went about doing good.' Hence, "it would be rash to rule out lightly any miracle, however unlikely it may seem in these calmer days, so long as it was found to touch life on its moral side."[1] In the case of the man who was deaf and had an impediment in his speech, our Lord looked up to heaven and groaned, even as He wrought the cure.[2] The healing of the epileptic boy was distinctly attributed by our Lord to His own prayer-life, as the impotence of the disciples was attributed to lack of the same. This means that the miracles must be estimated in the light of our Lord's own subjective experience as controlled by His Father's gracious motive. Such a view is justified by the synoptists, and it explains the description of the miracles in the Fourth gospel as the 'works' of God.

2. Our Lord regarded the effect of putting forth His divine power to heal as constituting a call to repentance on a great scale. His mighty works were acts of divine initiative to lead men to penitence and forgiveness. We are not told the nature of the mighty works which were done in Chorazin, but we are left in no doubt of their character in Capernaum. The paralytic, borne of four, was forgiven and healed in the latter

[1] Nairne, *Ep. of Priesthood*, 92. [2] Mc. 7. 32.

city ; and our Lord said explicitly that the miracle was done that they might know that He had power on the earth to forgive sins. Disease, paralysis, demoniac possession were cured in Capernaum, and such cures were acts of His gracious Will, intended to win men to repent. Moreover, Christ marvelled at the unbelief of His own countrymen when they had seen His mighty works. Such astonishment suggests that there were occasions when men did believe on Him through the works which He did.[1] Hence we conclude that our Lord regarded His mighty works, or miracles, as contributing to the realization of the purpose for which He came into the world.

3. Christ's answer to the disciples of the Baptist throws further light on His own valuation of the miracles. Plummer thinks that John could scarcely have been in doubt about Jesus, but was eager that He should make some public statement on His Messianic claims. Schmiedel sees in our Lord's answer the beginnings of the symbolism which is so rich in the Fourth gospel.[2] The criticism which doubts the genuineness of the whole passage because it cites miracles which 'Q.' is said not to relate is unconvincing.[3] What led John to ask his question ? Surely the works which He had heard. He found difficulty in reconciling such works with his view of the Messiah ; but his view of the Messiah was Jewish. John's preaching testifies to this, for he contributes nothing beyond ethicising the doctrines of the Jewish Church. He made no appeal in the name of divine Grace, although he struck at the roots of the Jewish Doctrine of Merit. The dominant note in his preaching was ethical. He predicted the coming Judge, *but a Judge who would condemn the Legalists.* To be a member of the Jewish Church, and be thrust out of the Messianic Kingdom, was unthinkable, until John preached impending doom. Moreover, he expected the doom to swoop down swiftly, but it had not yet come. The Baptist's difficulty, therefore, was to reconcile the works of Jesus and the continued existence in power of the Jewish Hierarchy. John's

[1] cf. Matt. 8. 27 ; Luke 7. 16 ; Mc. 2. 10.
[2] *Johannine Writings*, 97. [3] Thompson, 56.

views of Grace and Judgment were cataclysmic, and he looked for their consummation on a national scale. This, however, was not the full-orbed view that our Lord had of His work. Such an estimate of the Messiah's mission needed correcting by the works of Grace of which John had heard. That our Lord recognized the Baptist's difficulty of reconciling his Messianic expectation with the works of healing and preaching which he heard, is obvious, from the words, " blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in Me."

When such a direct issue was presented to Jesus, it is significant that He regarded His miracles and His preaching as accomplishing the same end. His ' works ' were no mere side issue of His life. He had received authority to heal and to do good on the Sabbath ; He had been anointed to recover sight to the blind ; His ministry of healing, and His ministry of preaching, were the maturing of His Grace.

E. Synoptic Evidence

It remains to review the synoptic evidence for the miracles which are prompted by the Grace of God in Jesus. It is unnecessary to discuss the ' heightening,' or ' corrections ' or ' duplicates ' in the synoptic tradition itself.

1. *Privative Cases*

In the cure of the deaf man with an impediment in his speech the multitude declared ' He hath done all things well,[1] ——and they glorified the God of Israel.'[2] The faith of Bartimæus led him to cry to Jesus for Grace. Matthew says the motive of the miracle was our Lord's compassion.[3]

2. *Cases of Bodily Disease*

The leper made direct and fervent appeal to the will of Jesus : " If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean." ' I will,'

[1] Mc. 7. 31–37. [2] Matt. 15. 31.
[3] Mc. 10. 46–52 ; Matt. 20. 34. Matthew says there were two blind men.

said Jesus, and Mark records that His will was moved by His compassion.[1]

The faith of the woman with hemorrhage[2] had a strain of magic in it, inasmuch as the garment of Jesus is part of her object. It was, however, the garment of Jesus that she willed to touch. The Grace of Jesus is seen in His power to heal her. This power operating through the subjective condition set up by her faith effected her cure. Thompson denies this view of Grace as power. He says it expresses a theory of the disciples which Jesus did not accept ; and there is no difference between the garment of Jesus and the garment of Trèves. He then concludes that it was a purely subjective cure. We prefer the account of the evangelist. The objective reality of the Grace of Jesus *first* explains the woman's putting forth of faith ; and " there is no reason for supposing that the miracle was wrought without the will of Jesus."[3]

Several cases of healing are peculiar to the Third gospel. The cure of the woman with a spirit of infirmity was due to the initiative of Jesus.[4] Our Lord related her physical to her moral condition. As an act of Grace He made her straight and loosed her from the bond of Satan. Luke, again, describes the healing of the dropsy case in the house of the Pharisee as due to the initiative of Jesus. It was an act of compassion which our Lord justified before His accusers.[5]

The ten lepers cried unto Jesus for Grace.[6] They obeyed Him and received cleansing. Thompson again nullifies the objective significance of Jesus in this incident. He is obsessed with Luke's motive, which he says led him to write up this event in the interest of the Samaritan who was a type of Gentile piety. " Because the men remained at a distance there was no means of telling whether or not they were healed."[7]

[1] Mc. 1. 40. [2] Mc. 5. 25–34, and parallels.
[3] Plummer, *Luke, in loco.* [4] Luke 13. 10 ff.
[5] 14. 1 f. ; cf. section in *Christ's Lordship of the Sabbath*, 65.
[6] Luke 17. 10 ff. [7] *Ibid.*, 89.

3. *Cases of Paralysis*

Luke introduces the incident of the paralytic,[1] by saying, that the power of the Lord was with Jesus to heal.[2] There is no event in the Synoptic gospels (and it occurs early in the ministry) which states the objective character of miraculous experience in plainer terms. The will of four men moved by faith in Jesus overcomes all hindrance. Then, Jesus assumes Himself to have unique objective significance for their faith. He knows that He mediates Grace to the soul and the body of the paralytic. He first forgives his sins, a miracle of Grace indeed! When He proceeded to heal the paralytic, it was that all might know that He was such an one as had power on the earth to forgive sins. The fact of this claim to forgive sins is totally ignored in Thompson's discussion of this event. The objective significance that he attaches to Jesus may be judged from his words that Jesus called upon the paralytic to exert himself, and do what be believed to be impossible; to Thompson the cure was entirely subjective.[3]

The motive of the miracle wrought on the man with a withered hand was to do good and save life.[4] It was due to the value which the Grace of Jesus set upon the individual.

The healing of the centurion's servant, which is assigned to Q., must be related to the authority of Jesus.[5] The centurion, under authority himself, had such a grasp of our Lord's authority on the earth, that Jesus had found nothing like it in Israel. And the centurion believed our Lord's authority to be due to the Grace of God prompting His works of healing. The merit pleaded by his friends is in strange contrast to the demerit pleaded by the centurion. Our Lord put forth His authority to accomplish deeds of Grace, and healed the servant who was not present in person. Vicarious faith moves the Grace of God.

[1] Mark 2. 1–12 [2] Luke 4. 36. [3] p. 35. [4] Mc. 3. 1–6. [5] Matt. 8. 5 ff.; Luke 7. 1 ff.

4. *Cases of Exorcism*

Exorcism was practised by the contemporaries of Jesus[1] and is a common feature of ethnic religions. The contrast, however, in spite of all that is claimed to the contrary, between such exorcism and that of Jesus, is likened by Oesterley to "the contrast between folly and seriousness."[2] The cases of possession in the Synoptic gospels are more than psycho-physical maladies. They have a moral side. Modern psychology may have helped us to see that "the devil is not a creature whose existence is independently known to science," but that is no more than a difference of diagnosis. It might be added that neither psychology nor medical science has been able to rid the world of unfortunate people, sometimes harmless, often dangerous, always a burden to themselves and to society. Hysteria and moral insanity are present-day facts. And such patients as the latter do not belong to a class which has always *cured itself* by faith. "These are not the subjects among whom to look for examples of faith healing; and, it might be added, they are the subjects who lend themselves least of all to the modern remedial measures of hypnotism and suggestion." [3]

The first miracle recorded by Mark is a case of exorcism in the Synagogue.[4] That it was more than mental derangement seems obvious from the definition of the spirit as unclean. Luke accentuates the moral aspect of the case by saying the man had a spirit of an unclean devil. It may have been temporary moral insanity. The cure of Jesus was distinguished by two features. It was *immediate*, and there was a total absence of magical formulæ. It was in the fullest sense of the word an act of Grace, a new teaching, and with authority.

The Gadarence demoniac had an unclean demon or

[1] Mc. 9. 38; Matt. 12.–27.
[2] *D. C. G.*, I, 443; cf. Thompson, 36 f.
[3] R. J. Ryle, M.D., *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1907.
[4] Mc. 1. 21 f.; Lc. 4. 31.

demons.[1] This is emphasized in the confession, " my name is Legion." It was clearly a case of malignant insanity. The violent nature of his possession is brought out again by contrast with his condition of sitting, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus. Our Lord explained this miracle as an act of Grace. He also bade the man go to his friends and tell his experience of divine love—what great things the Lord had done for him.

The Syro-Phœnician's daughter had an unclean spirit.[2] The First evangelist describes this woman's triumph of faith : " be it done unto thee as thou wilt." This indicates the spiritual nature of the demand which her will had made upon Jesus. His Grace responded to her faith by healing her absent child.

Mark and Luke say that the boy with convulsions was possessed by an unclean spirit. Matthew calls him an epileptic.[3] The relation of this event to prayer for the father, the disciples, and for Himself, received considerable emphasis from Jesus. When the father realizes what ought to be his own subjective condition, his prayer becomes desperate : " I believe, help Thou mine unbelief." When Jesus declared that all things were possible to him that believeth, He revealed His consciousness of authority to do a work of divine Grace in him and for him who believed. He assumed in such words, that the objective aspect of miraculous experience was completely fulfilled in Himself. He further explained His power to do this miracle in relation to His own prayer-life. He had Grace, which the disciples had not, and He had it through His unbroken communion with His Father.

5. *Raising the Dead*

When Jairus made his request of Jesus,[4] Mark and Luke say that his daughter was still alive. They agree in reporting

[1] Mc. 5. 1–20 ; Matt. 8. 28–34 ; Lc. 8. 26–39.
[2] Mc. 7. 24–30 ; Matt. 15. 21–28.
[3] Mc. 9. 14–29 ; Matt. 17. 14–20 ; Lc. 9. 37–43.
[4] Mc. 5. 21–24, 35–43 ; Matt. 9. 18, 19, 23–26 ; Lc. 8. 40–42, 49–56.

that before Jesus reached the house of Jairus the girl was dead. All the synoptists record our Lord's words that the damsel was not dead but asleep. Thompson thinks that this case testifies to the determination of Jesus to work a miracle, and that He effected the cure (not a miracle) in an enthusiasm of faith. "The girl was not really dead, but Jesus thought her so, and dared to put His faith to the supreme test . . . the girl revived, faith was justified, and a miracle was proclaimed." The emphasis on the faith of Jesus is well placed. For the rest, this is such a misreading of the synoptic evidence that, for once, it is permissible to follow Schweitzer's favourite, if annoying, habit of interrogating his victims, and ask, how does Thompson know these things? There is nothing in this miracle to suggest an ecstatic state of Jesus. On the other hand, Jesus exhorts Jairus not to fear, but to concentrate his whole being in an act of faith. In assuming such objective value for the faith of Jairus, He manifests His consciousness of authority over disease and death. The raising of the girl was an indication of the gracious nature and scope of the Authority which had been delivered unto Him of His Father.

There can be no doubt that the son of the widow of Nain was dead.[1] Loisy thinks this incident is a type of the Jewish Church raised to life by the miraculous touch of Christ. Luke relates it as a real event in our Lord's historic ministry, and describes His motive on this occasion as compassion for the widow. It is not a case of heightening on the part of Luke, to give plausibility to the answer of Jesus to the Baptist's disciples about raising the dead. It is a stupendous triumph of the Grace of God in Christ over man's last enemy. We cannot get rid of the evidence in the synoptics that Jesus raised the dead.

6. *Nature Miracles*

A distinction between the nature and the healing miracles is made by some for the purpose of explaining the latter

[1] Luke 7. 11–17.

by psycho-therapeutic, and rejecting the historicity of the former. But the evidence is as sound for one class as the other. In turn, this has led to the symbolical method of explaining both classes. Such a method, however, demands a longer period between the ministry of Jesus and the writing of the Synoptic gospels than modern criticism allows. It also robs Jesus of the objective character which He claimed for Himself in miraculous experience. Calming the sea, and walking upon it, are represented as acts of Providence, full of Grace. Garvie says no natural explanation of the feeding of the multitudes is satisfactory; on this occasion our Lord's motive was compassion; and when compassion was His motive His resources were inexhaustible.

7. *Summaries*

On two occasions the synoptists make general statements on the ministry of healing. In the first summary, Matthew[1] interprets Jesus' works of healing through the consciousness of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah: "who Himself took our infirmities and bare our diseases." In the second summary, the multitudes were attracted "by hearing what great things He did."[2] The First evangelist again sees these works through the consciousness of the Servant. They are works of God's beloved Son, acts of Grace to bruised and broken lives, due to God's spirit prompting Jesus.[3]

Luke records that on one of the tours through the cities,[4] when Jesus preached the gospel of the Kingdom, certain women were with him, who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities. In this connection, as a study in the Grace of Jesus, attention must be given to Luke's mention of Mary of Magdala from whom seven devils had gone out. The gospels leave us in no doubt as to the Grace of her deliverance and the response evoked in the Magdalene's heart, by her experience of the forgiveness of the Master.

[1] 8. 16 f. [2] Mc. 3. 8. [3] Matt. 12. 15 f. [4] Luke 8. 1–3.

CHAPTER IV

GRACE AND SYNOPTIC ESCHATOLOGY

I. Preliminary Considerations

ON the subject of Eschatology there is remarkable verbal agreement between Jewish literature and the Synoptic gospels. This has led some critics to commit an error similar to that which was noticed in the discussion on miracles. The part has been abstracted from the whole, and Eschatology has been claimed to be the only key to the mind of the Master. But the fallacy of seizing on the points of agreement and neglecting those of difference, is nowhere more misleading than in this field of enquiry. The differences between Jewish and synoptic eschatology are bound up with the unique claims of Christianity; and if the evolutionary method breaks down at these differences that is no concern of ours. Schweitzer is really a thoroughgoing evolutionist who comes to his subject obsessed by forms and categories into which he must force reality before he can explain it.[1] This slavery to method leads to the neglect of the non-eschatological matter in the gospels, and ends in an artificial estimate of the Person and Work of Christ. It commits Schweitzer to his thoroughgoing predestinarianism and his eschatological sacraments. This method assumes that there is no innate difference between our Lord's apocalyptic teaching and that of Judaism; yea, the former is seen only as the development of the latter. But when Judaism is viewed

[1] In the Preface to the 2nd edition of his *Eschatology*, Charles says that he takes no notice of Schweitzer, on the ground that he shews no knowledge of original documents and makes no fresh contribution to the subject.

as religious decadence, as was shewn in the Introduction, what becomes of Jesus? He becomes no more than the child of His age; at the best He is the greatest seeker after God. As Bousset puts it: "Yet with all this—and here we touch the culminating point—He never overstepped the limits of the purely human. The Almighty God remained before his eyes a sublime and lofty presence; he did not presume to place himself at his side."[1]

Now our Lord's eschatological utterances must be interpreted through what we have already seen to be the motive of His life and mission. From the baptism onwards, through His own experience, His preaching and His miracles, His objective manifestation of divine Grace has been traced. The Parousia statements can never be divorced from these facts and receive just treatment. That is, they must be interpreted through His Will as we have seen it operating on the earth. His sayings on the necessity of His own death; its service for many; most of all its covenant significance, are vital to any understanding of His eschatology. "The cross issues in the Parousia; the Parousia gains all its meaning from the cross."[2] The Will of our Lord was consistent; and the motive which led Him to the cross was to achieve ultimate triumph. The same Will that initiated the Kingdom was to consummate it.

It is important to point out that Jesus gave existence to the Kingdom in the days of His flesh. There is direct evidence that He did so, while the indirect evidence of His gracious motive is overwhelming. He claims, by reason of His powers of exorcism, that the Kingdom had come upon them sooner than they expected.[3] The experience of deliverance from evil *was* membership in the Kingdom. The parable of the Sower, and the Seed growing secretly, assume the present existence of the Kingdom. "The Law and the Prophets were until John, from that time the good-tidings of

[1] *Jesus*, 202.
[2] H. T. Andrews, *London Theol. Studies*, 92.
[3] Matt. 12. 28. See Grimm-Thayer on *Phthanō*.

the Kingdom of God is preached."[1] Jesus pointed out to the Legalists that the publicans and harlots *were* entering the Kingdom of God.[2] Recalling the inwardness of the spiritual experience in Mark 7., words spoken to the Pharisees, we see how we should understand the saying, "the Kingdom of God is within you." Moreover, relationship with our Lord on the earth was to affect finally a man's future, on the occasion of the Parousia. Hence, in view of this moral continuity between the present and the future, it is impossible to abstract the Parousia utterances from our Lord's earthly activity, or to claim that Jesus only referred to the Kingdom in a future sense.[3] The above passages, added to former evidence for the objective Grace of God in Jesus, are conclusive that the Kingdom was a present gift, an objective manifestation of divine Grace to men on the earth. It now remains to shew the significance of the Parousia in relation to our Lord's motive in founding the Kingdom in the present world.

II. Synoptic Apocalyptic Teaching

A. *Christian*

It is our task to bring out clearly the motive of the Parousia as stated by Jesus. How do the method and occasion of the Parousia, as they were explained by Jesus, affect our task? Is His motive invalidated by certain views of His own age concerning the method and time of its occurrence? The writer has shewn that in the sphere of Will our Lord's authority was final. It has been sought to guard against any false abstraction of one ultimate aspect of His consciousness from the rest; that is, with all due regard to our Lord's thought and emotion, it has been claimed in the preceding pages that these are revealed through Himself, as giving full effect to the divine Will. The mightiest thing in Jesus is His Gracious Will. The Parousia utterances confirm this view.

[1] Luke 16. 16. [2] Matt. 21. 31.
[3] See Charles' *Eschatology* (2nd ed.), 371 ff.

Every discussion of the method and time of the Parousia soon finds itself involved in the question of our Lord's limitation of knowledge. In relation to time, such limitation was self-confessed. Also in regard to time, history is against the view that His Parousia would occur in that generation. Here, then, we are clearly face to face with our Lord's limitations in that aspect of His self-consciousness which we call Thought. The question then arises, how can this limitation of knowledge be reconciled with His claims to authority, and His consciousness of the ultimate victory of His will ? *Surely, because His final victory was morally conditioned, and He knew that He fulfilled the conditions.* "It did not lie," says Fairweather, "within the scope of His Messianic mission to disclose future history."[1] On the other hand, a comparison of His limited knowledge of the future with such sayings as, 'I came,' 'I was sent,' 'the Son of Man has authority,' along with His views of His death, throw into greater splendour the unhesitating conviction that He was the Bearer of the Grace of God unto man's final redemption. The character of His ethical demands on His followers will also be found to support this view.[2]

The apocalyptic sections in the Synoptic gospels have not all equal claims to consideration. Before proceeding further it will be well to understand what sayings are indisputably to be attributed to our Lord.

'For whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and my words the Son of Man also shall be ashamed of him when He cometh in the glory of His Father with the holy angels.'[3]—Mark 8. 38 (Matt. 16. 27 ; Luke 9. 26).

'Verily I say unto you, there be some of them that stand here which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom.'—Matthew 16. 28 (cf. Mc. 9. 1 ; Luke 9. 27).

[1] *Background of the Gospels*, 295. On various interpretations of our Lord's Parousia sayings, see Andrews' contribution to *London Theol. Studies*.

[2] cf. Book II. ch. v.

[3] The parallels should be consulted in each case.

'Take ye heed, watch and pray, for ye know not when the time is. . . . Watch, therefore: for ye know not when the Lord of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cock-crowing, or in the morning; lest coming suddenly He find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.'—Mark 13. 33–36 (Matt. 24. 42; Luke 21. 36).

'Henceforth, ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.'—Matthew 26. 64 (Mc. 14. 62; Luke 22. 69).

In the above sayings the Parousia will take the world by surprise. As men pursue their even way, some catastrophic event, when it is least expected, will overtake them. The Grace of God will also be seen in this objective wonder of the future. It will be a unique act of divine Grace; an event over which the human will has no control whatever; for it will be initiated and consummated from above. In these passages the divine Will is not conditioned by any circumstances on the earth: no physical event is conceived as being able to condition it. The Parousia has, it will be seen, no other than a purely spiritual setting. The parables of the Wheat and the Tares, and the Drag-net, support this view; they shew how the new divisive principle which commenced to operate in the world during the days of our Lord's ministry shall receive final and permanent fulfilment at His return. By an act of Grace the wheat shall be garnered, and the good gathered into vessels.[1] Likewise, the parable of the Gathering of the Nations has less significance for Christian apocalyptic than for the new ethical character of Christian Judgment; it has therefore been discussed elsewhere.[2] The repeated injunction to the disciples to watch, lest they should be surprised as were the generations of Noah and Lot, are equally vital to our

[1] On the relation of the parables to their explanation by the Evangelist, see Dobschütz, *Eschat. of the Gospels*, 84; Burkitt's *Gospel History and Transmission*, 196.

[2] Book II, ch. v., D.

Lord's ethical teaching as they are to His eschatology. Neither the ethical nor the apocalyptic aspect of His teaching can be completely transmuted into each other, neither can they be divorced. The disciples are to watch, since His coming shall be sudden as the lightning. But no conditioning event nor moment is specified. Luke says the parable of the Pounds was spoken to correct the supposition "that the kingdom of God was immediately to appear": a considerable period is assumed for trading, and it is after a long time that the Lord of those servants cometh and maketh a reckoning with them.[1] The parable of the Virgins reveals the same need for ethical alertness in relation to the coming of the Bridegroom.

We conclude, then, that our Lord held that His Parousia would be catastrophic, unexpected, an act of Grace as divine visitation, or intervention, during the lifetime of His contemporaries. Forrest thinks the cumulative evidence goes to shew that Jesus had no such idea of an immediate return as the Apostles ascribed to Him.[2] The cumulative evidence is weighty, especially on the ethical side, but the apocalyptic sayings which are universally attributed to Jesus are evidence that He expected an early consummation of His purpose. "There is not a single writer in the New Testament . . . who does not look forward to the personal return of Christ in his own generation."[3] And it is within this limit that we must understand our Lord's confession that He did not know the day nor the hour of His return.[4]

B. *Jewish-Christian*

The critical results concerning Mark 13. bring out clearly, in the Christian sections, the view of the Parousia as explained above.[5] Before its occurrence the disciples were to experi-

[1] Matt. 25. 19.
[2] *Authority of Christ*, 323.
[3] Charles, 387.
[4] Andrews, *ibid.*, 87.
[5] A number of scholars remove *vv.* 7, 8, 14, 17–20, 24–27, 30, 31 from Mark 13. The excision of these verses restores harmony of thought to the rest of the chapter. The verses above also constitute what is called 'The Small Apocalypse.'

ence persecutions which would strain their powers of endurance; but the Grace of God, through the Holy Spirit, would prompt their words of defence and inspire their fidelity. Still, in the Christian sections of the Apocalypse the Parousia was not dated, not even approximately, by any physical or political convulsions. It is indisputable that our Lord foretold the overthrow of Jerusalem. Mark 13. 4 f., however, suggests that He was conscious, that His prophecy and its fulfilment would furnish an occasion for the wildest apocalyptic hopes, deceiving if possible the elect. He is aware of the possible reaction of such an event on the Parousia expectation, and He put His followers on their guard against it. The warning was only partially heeded. Soon after His death the primitive Christian community wove His words on both events into one argument. The results of this process have been disastrous, for in the Christian Church it has not infrequently happened that the Jewish element in apocalyptic has triumphed over the Christian, and the arbitrary views of divine Grace, which are thoroughly Jewish, have obscured the spiritual brilliance and steadiness of the Christian Hope.

For the elimination of the Jewish from the Christian sections in Mark 13., the reader is referred to Charles' work[1] or some modern book on New Testament Introduction. Charles regards this small apocalypse as a "Christian adaptation of an originally Jewish work."[2] As was pointed out in the Introduction to the present work, Jewish apocalyptic was partly a revolt from the pessimism of present political conditions, and one of its characteristic features was to associate the consummation of the kingdom from above with wars, famines, tribulations, or with such physical events as earthquakes and the reversal of natural law as set forth in Joel.[3] In Mark 13. 7–8, 14–20, 24–27, all these features are found. Following some remarkable natural phenomenon, such as the

[1] *Eschatology* (2nd ed.), 382 f., where the Apocalypse is given in full.

[2] *Ibid.*, 384. [3] 2. 30–31.

sun being darkened, and the collapse of civilization, conditions peculiar to Jewish apocalyptic, the Son of Man may be expected to come on the clouds. Divine Grace would then be manifested to the elect ; for their sakes God would shorten the days. The use of *eklektous*,[1] only found in this chapter, to describe those who shall be gathered together at the coming of the Son of Man, is distinctly Jewish, and reminiscent of I Enoch. So is the gathering of the elect from the four winds of the earth. Luke interprets this Jewish view of Grace as deliverance from their sorrowful conditions ; a divine visitation full of comfort.[2]

The First evangelist has the Jewish apocalyptist's fondness for times and seasons, and the tendency to condition the Parousia by some historical event. According to Mark,[3] the Gospel must first be preached to all nations, but Matthew adds, " and then shall come the end."[4] Again, Matthew fixes the end in relation to the missionary circuit of the cities of Israel.[5] The Jewish apocalyptic conception of Grace as seen in the attempt to condition the Parousia may also account for some of the touches of Jewish exclusiveness in the First gospel.

The apocalyptic element in the Gospels is seen to raise acute critical questions. The greatest difficulty is to decide how far the apocalyptic categories of our Lord's age were used later to modify His words. We have seen that one view of the Parousia in the Synoptic gospels is purely spiritual, while another view approximates to the Jewish apocalyptic hope. When we remember that Jewish eschatological expectations were the dominant religious conceptions of our Lord's day, and that with such hopes He was compelled to find some historical starting-point for His own ideas, it is not surprising that difficulties, such as we are conscious of, have arisen. Regarding one thing, however, we are left in no doubt ; fortunately there is abundant material for learning the nature of Jewish apocalyptic ; and for the purpose of bringing out

[1] Mc. 13. 27. [2] Luke 21. 28. [3] 13. 10.
[4] 24. 14. [5] 10. 23.

the Doctrine of Grace in Jewish sources we entered into the matter more thoroughly than may have seemed necessary for the purposes of Introduction. Neither Jewish nor Christian apocalyptic will explain itself. To understand Jewish apocalyptic we must penetrate to its doctrines of God, man, and Grace ; for Grace and not Judgment is the foremost thing in the Jewish hope.

In the Introduction we noticed the determinism which predestined the Jewish Church to life, and the Gentile world to death ; but this view is consistently absent from, yea, it is continually challenged by, the teaching of Jesus. The Jewish conception of Grace as arbitrary action from above is nowhere found in the revelation of the Father's Grace by Jesus. The Jewish view of man is entirely set aside by the Master's teaching on the intrinsic worth of the individual to God. In Judaism the Son of Man makes no appeal to sinners. In the Gospels we are compelled to reckon with a Person who is conscious of unique relation with God and man, both in the present world and in the future. Hence, when we make a wide comparison between Jewish hopes as set forth in the Introduction, and the teaching of our Lord as a whole, we are conscious that He differed acutely from Judaism on the very points which were most essential to the cohesion and unity of its eschatological hopes. The truth is, Jesus could not have held the Doctrine of Grace which He did and, at the same time, have fitted His teaching into the Jewish apocalyptic categories of His age. And it was on the Doctrine of Grace that His difference was so fundamental and irreconcilable. Now the spiritual view of the Parousia which is set forth in the Gospels contradicts nothing in the whole tenor of Christ's teaching. It agrees with His message on the Father's Grace as revealed in His motive to seek and save the lost : it is a true development of our Lord's teaching on God and man : it is progressive with all that we have seen to be central to the divine purpose in history, and in Christ's own will. On one vital matter Jewish and Christian apocalyptic agree—the divine purpose will be realized in some cataclysmic act. We

claim, however, that the innate differences between the Jewish Kingdom and the Kingdom of God as revealed by Jesus make the motive for the consummation by catastrophe in the latter case very different from what it is in the former.

III. Final Grace [1]

The evidence is that our Lord expected the course of human history on this earth to come to an abrupt close ; and He taught that such an event would be the consummation of the divine purpose in history. If this transcendent act did not occur when He expected it, the Father's motive is not thereby invalidated, nor is the will of Christ less transcendent in its operation upon men. Final Redemption is still to come from above, and must come, for the divine Will is essentially greater than any method through which it elects to work. One thing is clear, it is impossible to confine the operations of Will to the process of intrinsic adaptation. T. H. Green built his ethical system on the immanent spiritual principle in man and nature. The weakest part of his argument, its aspect which has attracted criticism from Sidgwick onwards, is the unsatisfactory statement of the goal to which society is moving. Green reasoned that moral good was attained when the Eternal Consciousness reproduced itself in man and became an objectifying principle to itself. He said that the idea of moral good and the direction of its goal must be learned through the institutions and customs of society in which the Eternal Consciousness has so far embodied itself. If such Thought, however, is to realize itself in racial progress only, what becomes of the individual ? Does the Eternal Consciousness realize itself in him here or hereafter ? Further, there is the problem of evil. Green fails to do justice, both to the individual's future, and to the nature of evil ; and these failures are never overcome by those who rely on Divine Immanence alone. No conclusion can be satisfactory which

[1] Book II., ch. v., is vitally related to this section.

ignores or explains away the permanent reality of the individual for all time, or the reality of evil. Jesus taught both and set them both in relation to the effectual control of the Father's purpose. He was not unaware of the evolution of His own kingdom in society, or the evolution of evil. At the same time, it was an important part of His teaching, that an unexpected divine act would close each process in the present order of history.

It is unfortunate that this transcendent act should be treated so frequently under the aspect of Judgment. With Jesus, final judgment lies in the moral necessity of realizing the divine Will. The central fact of the Parousia, however, is not judgment but the objective manifestation of divine Grace.[1] Judgment follows from the intrinsic moral character of that Grace. God's motive towards men is gracious. As our Lord says, He " came not to judge the world but to save it." To the human will that closes with God's objective appeal in Christ, there is forgiveness on the earth. Now the act which was to end the present order of things was an intervention of Grace ; it was final redemption ; and the entrance of the faithful into the joy of their Lord. The early Christian community looked for the Parousia as an intervention from above that would complete their salvation. This fulfilment of the divine Will in some swift event was the central strand in their hope. They looked for the manifestation of Grace by crisis.

It is true that the early Christians were conscious that the gracious Will of God had a moral side—that of judgment, even the judgment of believers. The First evangelist is as decisive as Paul that the Son of Man will render unto every one

[1] Burkitt draws attention to the picture of the Last Judgment in the Sistine Chapel. " Behind the Priest, behind the Altar, behind the lighted candles, behind the sacred drama of worship, the Last Judgment is always there. The only thing that stands between the Christian worshipper and Hell is the Priest and the Altar. . . . Behind everything the Last Judgment looms in the background, universal, inevitable." Burkitt agrees with the central meaning of the picture, for he says : " The Doctrine of the Apocalypses is the doctrine of the Last Judgment." *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, 2.

according to his deeds.[1] This is no reversion, however, to merit as the basis of judgment. It is no lapse from Grace to Law; it is, however, "a problem to give us something to think about."[2] The Synoptic gospels regard sin as so real that even "believers are depicted as having in front of them a judgment in which they will be tried by works, not faith." The ethical condition of the believer will show the measure of his response to the Grace which operated within him and upon him. This ethical truth, lying at the heart of the Parousia hope, should lead us away from the idea that free Grace means moral anarchy. The objective control of the Grace of Jesus was to inspire the moral progress of His followers until the revelation of His Parousia as an objective manifestation of Final Grace. When He came it would be with great glory: the certainty of His coming, and the uncertainty of its day or hour, must be understood to have formed an integral element in Christ's supreme challenge to the human will.

If it is replied that catastrophic Grace is a purely Jewish conception, and that the Parousia sayings carry over the same arbitrary views of divine intervention, attention must be drawn to differences which are thoroughly Christian, and which are claimed to ethicise Christ's final manifestation of Grace. Take the title Son of Man. It is used in numerous synoptic passages which are non-eschatological. From Daniel, through Enoch, this title had more or less Messianic import, but the last thing to look for in the Jewish use of this title is consistency. Our Lord takes the title as ready material on which to work. It supplied Him with an historical starting-point, but He soon invested it with a content quite unknown to Judaism. We can trace His consistency concerning Himself and His central place in divine teleology by the use of this title. It was unique on His lips, and served to crown the whole of His Messianic activity. The vital difference between the Christian and Jewish use of the title is seen as follows: as

[1] 16. 27.

[2] Mackintosh, H. R., "Studies in Christian Eschatology." *Expositor*, July, 1914, 58.

Son of Man, Jesus brought divine Grace to *all men* who willed to receive it : He came to seek and to save the lost : He had authority on the earth to forgive sins : He was Lord of the Sabbath : as Son of Man He came to suffer and to give His life a ransom for many. This last point of difference between our Lord's use of the title and that in Jewish literature, none would dispute. And between these earthly functions of the Son of Man and His Parousia there cannot be an irreconcilable dualism. He is the same Person : His motive in returning is, to His mind, one with that which brought Him into the world. " The Son of Man in the mature mind of Jesus is the Person who unites a career of utmost service and suffering with a sure prospect of transcendent glory."[1]

Again, Jesus spoke of ' my Father ' in a unique sense. His Father was greater than the Kingdom, for it was His gracious will to bestow it as a gift.[2] The ethical ideal of the Kingdom *was* the Father's will. The Grace of His Father was to inspire the disciples in their persecution. In the passage which links the synoptic and Johannine views of the Father's relationship with Jesus, the former entrusts the latter with all mediation between Himself and man. The Father revealed the Messiahship of Jesus to Peter ; He also gives freely of His Grace in prayer. There can be no radical dualism between these passages which describe the Father's Grace in establishing the Kingdom on the earth, and those which speak of the coming of the Son of Man in the Glory of the Father. What is the import of such words ? Let us beware of missing their testimony to the transcendent spiritual nature of Grace in any attempt to preserve their literality on the one hand, or to explain them away on the other. Pfleiderer regards the kernel of the faith of Jesus as being the absolute value of the Kingdom of God. This absolute value is revealed in the surrender of the individual " to the eternal object of the universe." The kingdom will also come " in the continuous education of humanity through the natural evolution of social life."[3] In

[1] Muirhead, *Eschatology of Jesus*, 203.
[2] Luke 12. 32. [3] *Christian Origins*, 94.

the last sentence Pfleiderer dispenses with Jesus as entirely unnecessary to the consummation of the process. But this necessity of Christ as Consummator of divine Grace lies at the heart of His apocalyptic teaching. Remove that, and the nerve of the Parousia hope is destroyed. In this truth lies the permanent contribution of synoptic eschatology for all time. Jesus is conscious of Himself as Redeemer, and as giving effect to the gracious purpose of His Father. To Him, the Grace of God was no self-acting thing; Jesus revealed it in the putting forth of His own Holy Will, and the objective reality of God's Grace in Jesus on the earth would only be transcended by its objective consummation when He returned in the Glory of His Father.

Is this view of consummating the kingdom by direct intervention from above unethical? It must be admitted that our Lord regarded His Parousia as a miracle of Grace, as a supreme act of divine freedom. But so was His power to forgive sins. Forgiveness is an experience which involves two personalities, in which the motive of the one has everything to do with the motive of the other. And we cannot explain the Christian Ethic as due to some unethical experience. And to our Lord the Parousia was the resultant of the Father's motive in history. Edward Caird thinks that Paul carried over the Jewish theory of divine intervention to explain his own conversion, thus attributing conversion to some divine intrusion into human affairs. Caird does not see any need for this view. He thinks it is Jewish and unethical, and denies that Jesus countenanced divine operation by catastrophe. Whether a great thinker like Paul was capable of explaining his own conversion is scarcely open to discussion. It has been claimed in this work that Jesus, by direct action, wrought immediate and amazing transformations in men on the earth. The transcendental idea is therefore inseparable from Jesus, and the present writer does not see any inherent contradiction of principle between the operation of Grace in Jesus' forgiveness of the individual, and the operation of the Father's Grace in consummating the Kingdom. Our Lord's suffering

and sacrifice were eminently ethical and His Parousia gains its glory and power by virtue of the consistent motive on which He had acted and would one day act in returning.

The ethical character of the Grace of the Parousia is further seen in its correction of the Jewish ideas of divine judgment. The mechanical views of judgment in Jewish literature are corrected in the gospels. In our Lord's Parousia there is no suggestion of Grace as arbitrary favour. His Personality creates division between men on the earth, and in the future. Herein lies the germ of the teaching of the Fourth gospel, that judgment begins now, in that Light is come, and is continuous. It was Christ's doctrine of Grace that swept away the ethnic basis of judgment; for the greatest thing in Jesus was not judgment but Grace. Likewise the central feature in human motive was to be Grace, not judgment. And if the revelation of the Grace of the Lord Jesus involved judgment in the present and the future, the retribution was ethicised by the Grace. "Christ's eschatology is one of Grace. . . . But it throws into strong relief the responsibilities of the present existence, the certainty of the retribution of sin, the possibility of an eternal sin with an eternal penalty."[1]

[1] Salmon, Hastings *B. D.*, I, 753.

BOOK TWO

THE GRACE OF GOD OBJECTIVE IN JESUS AND SUBJECTIVE IN HUMAN EXPERIENCE

WE now proceed to discuss the psychological effect of the Grace of God in Jesus as seen in human experience. We have pointed out how the Grace of the Father was made real for men in and through the Personality of the Master. He invited men to receive the Grace He brought, and we now ask what psychological effect was produced in the men who did so. Jesus came to seek and to save the lost, and when He found them, how do they think and act, or how does Jesus expect them to think and act? And we must not only ask what control the Grace of Jesus has over men in the present life, but also what significance, if any, has the acceptance of, and response to, the Grace of God in Jesus on personal destiny? Paul called upon men to work out the immanent divine Grace of the Risen Lord, or Holy Spirit. Is there any basis for the Apostle's argument in the realms of experience which belongs to the historic ministry?

Apart from the evidence that we shall produce, we must reckon at every step with the example of our Lord's own Personal experience such as is set forth in Book I in the temptation narrative, in His prayer-life, and in the putting forth of His will unto the cross. In all this experience it must have been clear to the disciples that Jesus was inspired to do the Father's will. We would lay the greatest emphasis on this example for our present purpose. What the Father was to the Son, and to the Son's achievement unto death, could not

fail to impress on the disciples the nature of the experience which the Father demanded from them. It is vital to remember that our Lord's own Personal experience is the most convincing study in subjective Grace, for there we learn the appalling demands which the Grace of the Father made upon His will.

CHAPTER I

PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECT OF GOD'S GRACE IN MEN, PRODUCED BY JESUS

A. Experimental Effects

1. *Jesus Evokes Faith*

FAITH is a decision in which thought, emotion and will are all involved, and in which all are evoked by, and directed towards, a specific object. Faith is not intellectual assent to historical fact. Nor can it rest on the shifting sands of emotion. It is a decision which involves thought and emotion, but in which the will gives direction to the whole of the personality. It is the decision of one person responding to the decision of another. Hence, 'faith in Jesus' means an experience in which the Personality of Jesus or in which the Will of Jesus is objective to the whole of human personality, but especially the person as willing. The will of Jesus and the will of man are both real, both free, and both active. It is sometimes said that the synoptists record no incident in which Jesus is worshipped as God; that men do not repose in Him the faith that they repose in God. Let us examine the synoptic instances on this matter. It seems to the writer that there can be no doubt that Jesus evoked faith, and then controlled it as long as He remained its objective. Faith may begin in simple receptiveness, a subjective condition in which one is conscious of new forces stirring within, to which the will has offered no resistance: it may be simple contact between the human and the Divine; it is most marked in some strenuous putting forth of the human will which taxes the last ounce of man's endurance.

All this is manifest in the faith which is evoked by the objective character of the Grace of Jesus.

The value attached to faith by the synoptists is further seen in that it is never divorced from prayer-experience. If theological discussion of the term is absent, there can be no doubt that Jesus initiated the subjective experience which *He* describes as faith, and which in turn puts man's own spiritual powers to the test. The miracles are evidence of this. Jairus, out of an experience in which faith and prayer are both combined,—initiated by the Personal Presence of Jesus—made a further demand on the Will of Jesus to heal his daughter. Jairus is a religious man, as our Lord shewed. Through faith and supplication we see him staking his whole self on Christ's gracious power to heal. Our Lord inspired him that he should maintain this subjective experience; "Fear not, only believe." The end of this matter is that Jesus, who had initiated an experience in Jairus, which in turn conditioned His own power to heal, accomplished a work which must have evoked unbounded gratitude in the ruler's heart. Thus does the Grace of Jesus inspire human emotion.

Similar subjective experience is found in the Syro-Phœnician woman. Faith and supplication are both present, both are called forth by the objective reality of the Grace of the Master, and the subjective conditions continuing to persist in the suppliant led our Lord's Grace to achieve a direct ethical effect—the exorcism of her daughter's unclean spirit.[1]

Christ's commendation of the centurion's subjective experience shews how deeply spiritual it was. Great importance attaches to the words "I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel." Here was one whose faith in Jesus was so profoundly spiritual that he was persuaded that our Lord's gracious power to heal was not conditioned by physical contact. Faith in God Himself cannot have been more spiritual than was the faith of the centurion in Jesus. The whole energy of the centurion's being was in his request, and the Grace of Jesus responded by healing his servant.[2]

[1] Mc. 7. 30. [2] Matt. 8. 5 f.

The case of the epileptic boy is remarkable for its teaching on this matter. In one sense, Jesus throws the whole responsibility for the cure on the will of the father. His faith had already been evoked by Jesus, but it was too weak and halting. When the father realized his own lack, he appealed to Jesus to effect in himself that subjective activity which could morally condition His gracious power to heal.

It is often remarked that these instances do not warrant the conclusion that prayer was offered to Jesus during His ministry; that at the best they suggest that Jesus was no more than the greatest of the prophets. Now, the synoptists are recording facts—a very different proceeding from theorizing on the nature of faith, or prayer, or the Person of Christ. They present the above incidents as facts where personal forces were operating, and where the Person of Jesus was central. In the unity of the experience recorded by the synoptists, we can discern clearly the objective and subjective aspects. These suppliants do not leave us with the impression that they were experimenting with Jesus. It is impossible to regard their faith and prayer as mere ventures. They were arrested by, and held in the grip of, the Grace of the Master.

It is difficult to see how any clear-cut theological conceptions of the Person of Christ could have made any difference to the record of the experience under review. Had all concerned been convinced that Jesus was the Eternal Son of God according to the teaching of the Fourth gospel, it is reasonable to say that their faith could not have been more intense nor more commended by Jesus. Previous to the Resurrection, the Synoptic gospels may not furnish a single instance where Jesus is worshipped, in so many words, as God. But neither prayer nor worship is a thing of words. The use of *proseuchomai* or any other word is not final in this matter. What we have to do is to account for the subjective experience under review, and not deny it, or explain it away as pure subjectivism. And we cannot explain it on any other ground than that it was the objective Grace of Jesus which

evoked the experience which He called faith. His gracious Personality appealed to men and continued to inspire those who responded to Him.

2. *The Call and Mission of the Disciples*

The call of the disciples was to a career. It involved, therefore, a deliberate choice on their part. It was so deliberate that not one of the disciples revoked his decision, until after the crucifixion, and then, with the exception of Judas, it was only temporarily. How came these men to leave all and follow the Master? It would be idle to ignore the subjective strain that they were called to bear. It would be an utterly superficial estimate of their discipleship to say that their motives were always unworthy or selfish. It is absurd to write as though they were capable of being deluded all the time, as is the habit of some critics. In several of them we can discern a progressive spiritual experience. Peter was conscious of his own sinfulness when he received his call. So must it have been with Levi, the publican. But when our Lord called the disciples He made a direct appeal to their wills; it was the objective appeal of His Grace, and they accepted it and responded to it. They did not decide on their own initiative to attach themselves to Jesus. It was He who moved them to their decision. Once that decision has been taken we begin to witness remarkable subjective effects in the disciples. "And He appointed twelve that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach and to have authority to cast out devils."[1] These words describe our Lord as the author of that subjective experience which is known as Christian discipleship. He called into existence the nucleus of the Messianic congregation; and He made known to them His motive for doing so; it was to preach and to heal. He alone was to equip them for their task: "*I* will make you fishers of men." The will of the disciple, prompted by the Grace of

[1] Mc. 3. 14.

Jesus to a great decision, was to be inspired by the same Grace to do the work of the Master in the world, namely, to preach and to heal. And we are told that they went out and preached that men should repent, or as Luke says, they went throughout the villages preaching the Gospel and healing everywhere. We are not concerned just now with the exact content of their message. We should say that it contained the good-tidings of the Divine Quest and Welcome ; that it was an appeal to men made in the name of the Grace of God ; that it must have made known the new emphasis on Divine Fatherhood and forgiveness. Nor could they have preached the kingdom and left Jesus out of their message. Further, their preaching was to be of such a character that our Lord expected them to encounter opposition. But as He sent them, He said, " Freely ye have received, freely give."[1] When He uttered His final commission He said, " Lo I am with you alway." Hence, we are confronted with subjective experience of such a nature, and directed to such a goal, that it is inexplicable apart from Jesus as its personal source and inspiration. This will become clearer as we examine those passages which deal with Holy Spirit.

3. *The Consciousness of Holy Spirit*

The Synoptic gospels have no more than occasional references to the Holy Spirit as divine power at work within men. This is what we should expect. According to the Fourth gospel, Jesus promised the Paraclete after His death :[2] during His ministry the " Spirit was not yet . . . because Jesus was not yet glorified."[3] Can we say that what the Holy Spirit or the Living Christ is to the genesis and sustenance of the divine life in man in Paul's Epistles and the Johannine writings, that the Personality of Jesus is in the Synoptic gospels ? The early Church saw that the Holy Spirit could alone explain our Lord's presence and mission in the world. Is Jesus necessary to explain the Holy Spirit as originator

[1] Matt. 10. 18. [2] John 16. 7 ff. [3] John 7. 39.

and sustainer of Christian experience in post-Ascension days? In other words, did Jesus fill that office during His ministry which the Holy Spirit fills in later New Testament experience?

John said, "He shall baptize you with Holy Spirit."[1] He makes a comparison between his own baptism by water as an external rite, and baptism by Jesus as an immanent experience of divine Grace as power. Here then, it is claimed that Jesus shall bring to men a consciousness of superior moral resources. The baptism of Holy Spirit was to be an experience in which the human will was prompted and inspired to achieve the richest ethical results. The Baptist was speaking of immanent divine power after the manner of the prophets and Psalmists. "Quicken me according to Thy *ḥesedh*,"[2] prayed the Old Testament saint, clearly revealing his consciousness of Grace as an immanent energy. "And I will put my spirit within you and cause you to walk in my ways, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them."[3] "The Spirit of God," says A. B. Davidson, "*ab intra*, in the Old Testament, is God active, showing life and power."[4] The bestowal of Grace as power to help man was not unknown therefore to the prophets, but the greatest of them in the Old Testament is never credited with being its Personal objective reality. Jesus was Grace, objective, incarnate, and we proceed to shew the psychological effects of this Personal reality in the commission of the disciples.

We have seen that our Lord attributed His own powers of exorcism to the Spirit of God. When we read that Jesus gave His disciples power over unclean spirits,[5] we infer that He must have communicated to them His own divine powers of exorcism.[6] And their consciousness of such powers can be explained only as a result of their baptism of Holy Spirit. That is, when Jesus sent His disciples forth He endowed them with immanent divine energy. Their wills

[1] Mark 1. 8.
[2] Ps. 119. 158, *ḥayyeni*=Give me vital force.
[3] Ezek. 36. 27.
[4] *Theology O.T.*, 126
[5] Mark 6. 7.
[6] See Denney, *D.C.G.*, I, 733.

had already closed with Jesus and we now begin to see the measure of Christ's control over their subjective activity. Hence, their powers of exorcism were not arbitrarily bestowed : such powers belonged to men whose wills were rising to the demands of Christ's will upon them. When the seventy returned they described to Jesus their amazement ; " even the devils are subject unto us *in Thy name.*"[1] Nothing short of some extraordinary experience can explain these words, an experience in which the disciples were conscious of superhuman power operating in and through themselves. The gift of such immanent Grace may have been accompanied by pneumatic as contrasted with normal conditions, which Denney suggests to have been the case with Jesus at His baptism and transfiguration.[2] The disciples, however, were under no delusion as to the source of their powers of exorcism. They were not self-derived. They were by " His name." There were occasions when their will, weak through prayerlessness, hindered the possibilities of Christ's Grace within them, as in the case of the epileptic boy. In other words, our Lord's comment on their failure makes it clear that their possession and use of the powers of exorcism were ethically conditioned. It was a moral gift, and it was available, only so long as the will continued in a condition of surrender to Christ. The Grace of Christ did not work through vacant minds and hearts. The will of man to receive and to use Holy Power is as real as the Will of Christ to bestow it ; but the Grace that bestows it demands, by its own intrinsic nature, certain moral conditions in the recipient, such as are denoted by faith, prayer and surrender to Christ. Granted these conditions, the Grace of the Master inspires the human will to cast out devils.

In the Eschatological discourse of Mark 13. the references to the Holy Spirit reflect the experience of the early Christian community. Still, Jesus clearly foretold of persecution for the disciples, and it is reasonable to assume that He would give them guidance before such trials came. So

[1] Luke 10. 17 ; cf. Mc. 9. 38 f. [2] *D. C. G.*, I, 732.

that we are dealing with the Word of Jesus if not with His words. When the city and the Temple were overthrown, the disciples were promised the inspiration of an Advocate who would speak by their mouths as truly as He spake by the mouth of David or Isaiah. Our Lord's promise refers to a crisis and must be regarded as being fulfilled in one of those rare spiritual experiences which form a crisis in the history of human personality. When persecution arose, the Spirit would fulfil in them "that office which Jesus Himself would have undertaken had He been still with them."[1] Their speech on that occasion would be inspired: "it is not ye that speak but the Holy Spirit."[2] Luke, in a doublet, expresses the promise of Jesus as being realized in an extraordinary gift of convincing speech: "I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to withstand or gainsay."[3] Obviously, Luke meant the same thing as Mark, but whereas the latter attributes their testimony to the direct action of the Holy Spirit, the former attributes it to the direct action of Jesus. In either case, their witness would be due to the immanent action of divine Grace within them. No essential distinction is drawn between the act of the Holy Spirit and the act of Jesus. They are both one and the same action. The First gospel inserts the above promise in the charge to the twelve: "it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father that speaketh in you."[4] And Matthew would lead us to understand that it was fulfilled during the missionary circuit.

When due allowance has been made for any 'form' given to our Lord's words by the early Christian community, the promise of a remarkable power of speech is indisputably to be traced to Jesus. Luke definitely describes their eloquence as the Lord's gift, a direct subjective effect of His Grace, although when the crisis came, His physical

[1] Swete, *The Holy Spirit in N.T.*, 122.
[2] Mc. 13. 11. [3] Luke 12. 11 f.
[4] Matt. 10. 19, 20.

presence would have been withdrawn. Their powers of speech and exorcism were due to our Lord's own initiative and inspiration. Further, the Master's objective control of the personality of His disciples did not stunt their individuality. By drawing forth the disciples' powers of volition, such control was developing human personality along the line of its true progress.

The words of the Risen Redeemer that *He* would send the promise of His Father upon the disciples,[1] refer to the Holy Spirit, who shall be to them all that Christ had been and continue to clothe them with power as He had done while He was with them on the earth. The Spirit would prompt their understanding and conscience concerning the central place of Jesus in the divine purpose ; would bring such an access of emotion as would move their being to its depths ; and would urge their will to preach repentance and remission of sins in His name unto all nations.[2]

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament is the work of men who knew the dynamic of divine Grace within them : it is the effect of the subjective experience of such Grace. For our immediate purpose it is enough to have shewn that the Synoptists regard the psychological effects of divine Grace as manifest in remarkable emotional experiences, and in the putting forth of the will to exorcise unclean spirits. And such effects were ascribed to Jesus under the historic conditions of the ministry.

4. *Revelation through Subjective Experience*

A. *Matt.* 11. 25–27 ; *Luke* 10. 21–22

This Thanksgiving Prayer belongs to the source Q. The historical context in Luke would seem to commend itself before that in Matthew. It is clear, however, that each evangelist regarded the prayer as offered in return for some direct communication to the disciples by the Father.

[1] Luke 24. 49. [2] Luke 24. 47.

What was meant by 'these things'? If they refer to the experience of the seventy on their mission, as Luke intends us to believe, they must mean, that in going forth to preach the kingdom of God, heal the sick, and cast out devils, in the name of Jesus, the seventy had been taught by the Father, and had learnt for themselves, truths which were hidden from the wise and the prudent of that generation. The most immediate connotation of "these things" would then be, that through the subjective experience of the seventy the Father had made a revelation concerning His Grace in Jesus. Their experience was of such a nature as to lead to the informing of their mind and their convictions. Now such revelation was not merely the communication of knowledge; it cannot be abstracted from their subjective experience in putting forth their powers of exorcism. Revelation always has a moral side, and it had in this case. Yea, its ethical character is the stamp of its divine origin, for it involves the activity of the Divine and the human wills. He who receives revelation is not passive, any more than the disciples who received this illumination concerning Christ through the surrender of their will to His. In this universe of experience he who does the will of Christ shall know, but his knowledge is ascribed to divine Grace.

The First gospel associates the Thanksgiving Prayer with our Lord's woes on Chorazin and Bethsaida. Hence, Bruce finds a tone of resignation in the prayer, due to the apparent failure of the ministry in the cities of Galilee. Still, it should be noticed that the prayer follows the charge to the Twelve, and the bestowal of power over unclean spirits. Under such circumstances, Matthew accentuates the reasoning above. "These things" would then refer to the mighty works which Jesus Himself had done in the cities and which had not effected the subjective condition of faith and surrender to the will of Jesus which was characteristic of the disciples. The mighty works had failed to evoke penitence in the hearts of the wise and prudent, and where there was no penitence there was no revelation. It was otherwise with the 'babes.'

Again, our Lord's contrast between the two classes — the 'wise' and the 'babes' — serves to indicate the nature of the direct action attributed to the Father. It is conclusive that revelation is never a merely intellectual process; in this case it was made through profound spiritual experience which had its source in Jesus. The 'babes' were illiterate, the 'wise' were the Jewish intellectuals. Calvin thinks that at this point Jesus raised the whole question of the relation of the intellect to religion, and condemned all intellectual striving after God. There is no need, however, for any interpretation which would disparage the powers of the human mind. It was unnecessary to despise such powers in order to magnify the Grace of divine revelation. We must look for the different conceptions of revelation held by the 'wise' and by Jesus, as manifested in this prayer. Deutero-Isaiah said of Babylon, "thy wisdom, and thy knowledge, it hath perverted thee."[1] So it was with the wise and prudent in relation to Jesus. They laboured under the dogma that Divine Revelation had ceased, that it was definitely and irrevocably fixed in the Torah. All that needed to be done was to deduce from the Torah such regulations as were necessary for the approach of man to God, and man to man. Religion for them revolved round that issue. But the prayer of Jesus disproves that revelation is something static, something committed to the guardianship of the 'wise.' The 'wise' were even then searching the Scriptures, thinking that in them was eternal life, and they refused to surrender themselves to Jesus—as the 'babes' had done—to find life. The 'babes' had made the great surrender and knew in themselves the dynamic of Christ's mighty works. Hence, the Father in His good pleasure had led them a step forward concerning their understanding of Jesus, the source of their unique experience. God did not elect the vacant minds and hearts of fishermen and commit to them some secret for the sale of humiliating the 'wise.' On the basis of a discredited faculty psychology it is misleading to build any such artificial theory of divine

[1] Isa. 47. 10.

revelation. There is that in man to which Jesus makes His appeal, and it was in these 'babes.' They responded to the Master's appeal, and this revelation for which Jesus exults in Spirit before the Father came through the reciprocal action of His Will and theirs. Christ was God's goodness in immediate contact with their will. It is the absence of this Personal contact between Jesus and the 'wise' which accounts for the things which were hidden from them. On account of the moral character of the Grace of God in Christ it could not be otherwise.

In this gracious revelation of the Father to the 'babes,' the place of Jesus was central. Without Him there would not have been the subjective experience through which the revelation was made. It is in the context of this prayer that our Lord's unique relation to God and man is most strongly claimed, and that Jesus speaks of the Great Committal. And if Jesus attributes direct action to His Father in the prayer, it is obvious that the conditions of such revelation were due to Jesus, that unless He had been the source and inspiration of such conditions, there could have been no revelation concerning Him. The Grace of Jesus and the Grace of the Father were both real; for they were a unity; and they both contributed to effect the same subjective results.

B. *Matt.* 16. 17.

The inspiration of Peter's great confession at Cæsarea Philippi was attributed by Jesus to His Father in heaven. Wendt eliminates that section of the verse which ascribes Peter's confession to the Father, but the textual evidence for these words as an integral part of verses 17–20 is overwhelming. "These words are more likely to be organic to a Gospel which reflected the later Catholic consciousness of Christianity . . . than a later interpretation in a very early Gospel."[1] Though Allen regards the references to the Church and the Kingdom as the work of the evangelist, verse 17 "is in every respect suitable to the context."[2] Its thought

[1] Moffatt, *I. L. N. T.*, 252. [2] *Comm. on Matt., in loco.*

fully harmonizes with the revelation of the Father to the 'babes,' although it sharpens the contrast between the powers of the human reason and the Father's gracious will to reveal Christ. While our Lord does not say that it was truth which flesh and blood could not discover, He means us to understand that.[1] He said in effect that the consciousness of His Sonship could have no other than an inspired source. The conclusions of flesh and blood concerning Him are told by the evangelists. Both the Legalists and the populace missed their way in this matter. If wisdom in itself had counted for everything, the custodians of the Torah, the sum of Divine Revelation, should have reached the conclusion of Peter regarding the Divine Sonship of Jesus. But such a conclusion could never be drawn from legalistic premises, it must be rooted in personal experience. A comparison of this 'revelation' with the most spiritual methods of divine communication to men in the Old Testament should be noted. The prophets built "their faith on inner conviction rather than on outward event."[2] At the same time, in the eighth-century prophets, "there is a remarkable sense of external compulsion . . . due no doubt to the vivid imagination by which ideas in the prophet's mind acquired objective reality, independent of the prophet's own personality."[3] The great contrast lies in the nature of the objective reality as present to the consciousness of the prophets and Peter. To the latter, it was the revelation of Grace embodied in a Unique Personality.

This fact makes arbitrary divine action unnecessary to explain the revelation to Peter. His consciousness of Jesus as Son of God was rooted in a subjective experience initiated and objectively controlled by Christ. Were this revelation no more than an informing of the mind of Peter, it would be relevant to ask why it had not been made before; and it would then be totally unlike the revelation made to the 'babes.' God's revelation to man rests on no such fallacy as a

[1] On "flesh and blood," cf. B. Weiss, *Bib. Theol. N. T.*, I, 122.
[2] H. Wheeler Robinson, *Religious Ideas of O. T.*, 122.
[3] *Ibid.*, 155.

faculty psychology. It relates to the whole of human personality, including thought, emotion, and will. The gospels themselves testify to the development of the subjective experience in relation to which the confession of the Apostle must be understood. Mark especially shews the psychological effect of the Person of Jesus on the disciples, leading them to ask on one occasion, " What manner of man is this ? " Their thought, emotion, and will were exercised about the extraordinary Person who had called them, and their own subjective experience which He initiated and inspired. It is our Lord's objective control of the disciples, and of Peter in particular, which led to the stupendous psychological effect at Cæsarea Philippi. Speaking for the rest, Peter says they are persuaded that He is the Christ. We have seen already the nature of the experience through which revelation was mediated to the ' babes.' It was a continuity of that experience, growing deeper as the will of the disciples responded to the will of Christ, which led to the Great Confession. The baptism of Holy Spirit, or continued personal contact with Jesus, inspired a conviction concerning His Sonship which could never have been reached by flesh and blood.

Again, Jesus attributed the knowledge of Peter to the direct action of the Father's Grace. It was knowledge, however, which cannot be divorced from the subjective experience which had been initiated and inspired by Jesus Himself. The Grace of God and the Grace of Jesus are a unity, and through Jesus such Grace worked within the disciples. Further, the disciples work out this immanent divine Grace in preaching and healing ; their will closes with Christ's will, until we discern that subjective experience at Cæsarea Philippi in which personal conviction concerning the Sonship of Jesus had reached finality.

5. *Summary*

Before proceeding further, it will be well to recall certain sections of Book I, which have significance for our Lord's personal prompting of subjective experience.

Virtue or power was seen to flow from Jesus for purposes of healing. There is no need to reason as though this were done apart from His will. His gift of power to heal was morally conditioned by the woman's faith. We infer that power which could heal could also quicken and sustain the moral consciousness.

The section which dealt with the Lord's Supper as a Sacrament is weighty evidence that the Grace of Jesus operated in the subjective experience of the disciples. Jülicher holds that the Supper has no significance for Christian Ethics. If we are correct, however, in interpreting the Sacrament in relation to the will of Christ on the one hand, and the will of the disciples on the other, that is, to motive in both; if Jesus was always a living Sacrament to faith in the days of the ministry, then it is impossible to abstract the Grace of God in Christ from psychological and moral effects in the disciples.

The parable of the Gracious Father is explicit synoptic testimony to divine Grace as the basis of our Lord's Ethic. The only possible reconciliation of the two sons is through a common relation to the Father. They cannot settle their own differences. Their conflicting temperaments can only be reconciled through the subjective experience of the same Grace. In that case, each will realize his own as well as his brother's highest good in surrender to the will of the Father. If it is said that this parable proves that Jesus is quite unnecessary to the achievement of such reconciliation, we believe it is enough to answer that the Grace of the Father's welcome was made known by Him alone, and that in Him such Grace was an objective Personal reality to publicans and sinners. We drew attention to the notion that divine Grace, as taught in this parable, was free and unconditioned, and that is the argument which is used by some for excluding Jesus from the subjective experience of the disciples such as we have claimed so far in the present chapter. It is true that our Lord ascribed revelation to His Father's direct action in the cases we have just discussed, but we have shewn that

such action was not arbitrary, it was Personal, and it was profoundly moral.

The truth is, there are critics, who have become more numerous of late, to whom such ideas as Transcendence and Immanence are never really *Personal.* Such critics repudiate the incarnation of these ideas, or realities, as we should call them, in the Person of Jesus, because they cannot conceive them incarnate in any Person who walks this earth. They use language concerning Thought, and mostly fail to do justice to such facts as emotion and freedom : or they write of Pure Being and fail to do justice to the human body : or they write of mystic forces, and seek salvation through ecstasy where all historical perspective is lost to sense, as though these metaphysical terms expressed the last word on God. Now, there is no category that we know higher than Personality, and no Person in history higher than Jesus. We hold that the Synoptic gospels set forth the Personality of Jesus in such a way as to involve all the truth and evade all the error contained in such terms as Transcendence and Immanence. The cumulative evidence produced so far, from an investigation of the objective and subjective aspects of divine Grace in the Synoptic gospels, shews that Jesus reconciled in His own Personality the idea of Transcendence and Immanence ; and that He regarded Himself as indispensable to the subjective experience of divine Grace in the disciples.

B. Christ's Interpretation of Experience Evoked by Himself

There are several parables and logia which teach implicitly the immanent activity of divine Grace in man.

1. *Parable of the Sower*

Mark 4. 1–20 ; *Matt.* 13. 1–23 ; *Luke* 8. 4–15

In the parable of the Sower and its explanation our Lord was presenting His own value-judgment of the Galilean

ministry. He was describing experience which was already historical ; the reception on the part of some of His objective Grace and the subjective activities which followed upon such reception. The parable makes it obvious that the nature or measure of the act of reception—the initial act of faith—was related to the depth, durability and results of subsequent activity.

The parable illustrates the nature of that experience which is membership in the kingdom. The Word of God is sown equally in all. The Sower, the sowing, and the seed cannot be abstracted from one another.[1] They express the whole of the objective aspect of the experience under discussion. The Word which is sown cannot be separated from Him who Personally embodies it and brings it. Those who hear the Word and accept it, or as Luke says, hold it fast, bring forth fruit with patience. And this was exactly what had already occurred in the case of the disciples. *It cannot be affirmed too strongly that Jesus was interpreting to His disciples their own experience and that of others.* That they should not be able to analyse it for themselves should not surprise us in the least. Reflection is the last stage in religious experience, not the first. And if our Lord does not explicitly attribute the act of their will as due to His Grace, and shew that their character and service are the working out of such Grace, it is because He is concerned with stating the fact of experience within the kingdom and without it, rather than with its mere analysis. In a measure, however, He does diagnose conditions as they existed at that moment. There was already a marked ethical difference between the disciples who had heard the Word and accepted it and those who had not done so, or had done so temporarily. Compare our Lord's words to the effect that Satan had taken away the Word which was sown by the wayside ; or that, because of tribulation or persecution, they that are sown among the rocky places stumble ; or that the cares of the world and

[1] Schweitzer says the initial fact of the parable is the sowing, that He who sows has no importance.—*Quest of Hist. Jesus*, 354.

deceitfulness of riches choke the Word in others, with the subjective activities of hearing, accepting, bringing forth with patience, in the case of those who were sown upon the good ground. Our Lord had sown Grace and Truth for the disciples and they had responded as will to Will, and out of the reciprocity of action between their will and Christ's, ethical fruit was already ripening, some thirty-fold, some sixty, some a hundred. The psychology of this parable and its explanation is focussed on the will. Its failures are those of the will. To overlook the essential relation between the good seed and the fruit it yields, between the objective and subjective sides of activity, in other words, between Grace and Ethics, is to miss its central meaning.

2. *The Growing Seed, Mustard Seed, Leaven*

Mark 4. 26–29, 30–32

The parable of the Seed growing secretly illustrates the unseen energies of Grace evolving in and through the human personality. That which is sown is capable of growing, given facilities for so doing. Grace operates not by leaps but by moral processes. Whether this parable refers to the development of the individual or the corporate growth of the kingdom, its interpretation turns upon the silent unseen dynamic of divine Grace working through personality until "the fruit is ripe." And in any case, Jesus assumes that such Grace is operating as immanent energy, even as He speaks.[1]

Nothing could be more unlike the Jewish conception of the kingdom of God than the view set forth in the parable of the Mustard Seed. And what is that which appears so insignificant, yet is pregnant with immeasurable possibilities? It is surely the corporate spiritual life of those who were members of the kingdom. When this parable was uttered the nucleus of the primitive congregation was despised and unpromising.

[1] Schweitzer (353) admits that these parables contain "a tremendous revelation," stating, "by what power, incomparably great and glorious results can be infallibly produced by an insignificant fact without human aid." The insignificant fact is that a man sowed seed.

Jesus, however, convinces them of their potential significance for future progress. The kingdom was a gift to each, but as each realized his gift in relation to Jesus, he must of necessity realize it in relation to others. The Grace which worked through each subjective experience inspired the corporate life of the whole. It was through the surrender of the will to the demands of divine Grace that the individual was led to identify his own highest good with the good of the whole kingdom.

The parable of the Leaven teaches the penetrative energy of divine Grace through the common spiritual life of the kingdom in society. The kingdom was even then an existing fact, and was already a spiritual dynamic within the society of that day. The leaven was given, and it penetrated the meal. As men received the kingdom they received immanent energy which must be worked out into ethical and spiritual values. The seed and the leaven are objective realities. In relation to the human will, they represent the objective reality of divine Grace as embodied in Jesus, a reality which prompts and inspires subjective activity.

3. *The Mystery of the Kingdom*

Mark 4. 11

Between the parable of the Sower and its explanation, the evangelists report our Lord's apology for using the parabolic form of utterance to achieve His didactic end: "Unto you is given (Matt. and Luke add 'to know') the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables: that seeing they may see and not perceive; and hearing they may hear and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them."[1] This saying on the 'mystery of the kingdom,' must be interpreted on the lines of the revelation to the 'babes,' already discussed.

What was the 'mystery' that was given? Schmiedel

[1] Note expansion of quotation from Isa. in Matt. 13. 14 f.

denies that there was any ' mystery,' or that such a term could have come from Jesus. Schweitzer regards the ' mystery ' as an eschatological secret, some supernatural knowledge concerning the plan of God which only the foreordained could receive. It revealed to the predestined that Jesus expected the catastrophic coming of the kingdom at harvest time.[1] But the parables and the ' mystery ' can be explained without the help of apocalyptic. Bacon thinks the elimination of Mark 4. 11–12 gives a more intelligible unity to our Lord's discourse. He suggests this, in the first place, because of the difficulty of attributing to Jesus the desire to veil truth from those who are without by means of the parable, when it is obvious that the " end of the parables themselves is the reverse of intentional obscurity." Secondly, the word ' mystery ' only occurs here in the Gospels, while in Paul it is found twenty-one times " and is fundamental." Still, it is acknowledged that the Pauline use of the word ' mystery ' has a real basis in the teaching of Jesus, and Bacon sees this basis in the revelation to the disciples which is the occasion of the Great Thanksgiving Prayer. And the " thing given or withheld is not certain elements of the Gospel, conceived only as *musteria* . . . but is the Gospel as a whole conceived as a mystery in the Pauline sense . . . Divine revelation."[2]

Considering the nature of the subjective experience through which revelation was made to the disciples, and the nature of the same experience which is set forth in the parable of the Sower, we have all that is necessary to the understanding of the ' mystery.' It is knowledge which is rooted in an act of will. If any man will do His Will, he shall know of the doctrine.[3]

To assume that Jesus dispensed secrets to the curious, or dealt with His disciples as the mystery religions dealt with the initiated, is to substitute all manner of summary and external methods in place of profound spiritual experience

[1] *Ibid.*, 356.
[2] *D. C. G.*, art. " Mystery." See Robinson, *Ephesians*, 234 ff.
[3] John 7. 17.

which has its source in Jesus. Our Lord's Grace appealed to the will, and through the response of the will there came a revelation, or 'mystery,' which it was not in the power of flesh and blood to acquire by its own unaided effort. Such 'mystery' was, and is still, an ever-deepening spiritual experience—bringing its own illumination and yielding a rich ethic—open to all, but known to none save those who accept and hold fast and bring forth in character and service the Grace of the Lord Jesus.

4. *That Which is Given*

Matt. 13. 12.

The subjective aspect of divine Grace is brought out further in the logion "whosoever hath to him shall be given, and he shall have abundance." Matthew inserts this saying after that on the "mystery of the kingdom," and therefore relates it to the experience denoted therein. Its recurrence in other connections suggests that it was a well-known formula with which Jesus concluded several of His discourses. "That which a man hath," must be the experience which is described as being the "mystery of the kingdom." Such psychological terms as hearing, understanding, accepting, holding fast, state the subjective side of an experience in which the Word of Jesus is the objective. Now, as the will holds fast the Word which is sown by Jesus or acts in response to the will of Jesus its own powers become enlarged; in other words, Christian motive is necessarily fertile, bringing forth after its kind. When the will is directed towards Christ more Grace is given, so that the will is further inspired and its capacities expanded the more. As thought, emotion, and will absorb the objective truth of the kingdom, so in this very act and process is the personality cleansed in vision and stirred to still deeper passions and activities. Between the objective and subjective aspects of Christian experience there is, therefore, a reciprocity which can be stated thus: whosoever hath the Grace of Jesus, to him more Grace shall be given, and he

shall have abundance. This means that the Grace of Jesus was, and is, inexhaustible for those who will transmute it into moral values. It means that the rewards of Grace are not *external*, but immanent spiritual realities which are most conspicuous in the expanding capacities of human personality for divine ends. The " mystery of the kingdom " involves this consciousness of the intrinsic value of motive which is inspired by the Master. Thus, its secrets are of the " nature of moral principles such as verify themselves in the experience of the loyal life rather than remain ' mysteries of faith ' in the later sense of these words."[1]

5. *Parables of the Pounds and Talents*

Matt. 25. 14–30 ; *Luke* 19. 11–27.

The First and the Third evangelists intend us to interpret the parables of the Talents and the Pounds through the logion we have just discussed.[2] In these parables our Lord teaches that strenuous *demands* are made on the human will by that which is ' given.' In the parable of the Pounds each man receives alike. In that of the Talents each receives according to his several ability. In neither case is it capacity which is received. Each recipient is assumed to have that already. The distribution of the Talents is based at the outset on capacity. Each man is given that which calls forth his powers of initiative and enterprise. For the sake of shewing the nature of personal responsibility in relation to that which is given, Jesus all but isolates the subjective from the objective aspects of experience within the kingdom. The profound ethical teaching of these parables is shewn in their presentation of fidelity to what is ' given,' as that upon which everything turns. At first sight, all the emphasis appears to lie on the will of the trader. It is necessary, however, to recall that he is trading with something which he received and which is continually re-acting on his own progress. When this truth

[1] Bartlett, *D. C. G.*, II. 703. [2] Matt. 25. 29 ; Luke 19. 26.

is related to the previous teaching of the Master, that which is 'given' is his initial experience of the 'mystery' of the kingdom. There is no such thing in the Synoptic gospels as native capacity for the highest spiritual and ethical achievements. This fact is sometimes overlooked by those who miss the sharp antithesis between divine Grace and human sin, in the Synoptics, such as is found in the Pauline epistles. There is little trace of any Doctrine of Sin in the Synoptics. At the same time, the abominable thing is there, as real and as pronounced, as in the experience of the Apostle. Our Lord asked those who confused the inner and outer aspects of experience how they were going to escape the judgment of Gehenna.[1] Sin was just as inward in its nature as thought, emotion, and lust.[2] But the synoptic conception of sin is also seen in the failure of man to respond to the demands of divine Grace. It is moral laziness, and lack of fidelity to what has been 'given.' Our Lord's view of sin comes out in these parables of the Pounds and Talents, and in the case of the wicked and slothful servant who knew his Lord's Will and did it not, sin is tracked to its home, which is the *Will.*

Jesus was more positive than Paul. He knew that His own Presence could convince men of sin and did convince them. Our Lord assumed that there was that in man to which He could make appeal, and when the human will responded, we find an experience in which man was conscious of receiving that which was to tax his energies to the utmost. This comes out clearly in the lord's reckoning with his servants. In each case the successful trader received the reward which corresponded to the measure of his response to the will of his Master. His reward, however, was not something external to himself, it was something which returned into the character of the will which was faithful to the Master. He does not possess the cities he rules over, he is still a steward of the mysteries of God. His fidelity to what was 'given,' or his response to the inspiration of the Grace of Jesus, has had the

[1] Matt. 23. 33. [2] Matt. 5. 28.

utmost consequences, for at one and the same time it has both created opportunity, and expanded the capacity to seize it and use it to the full. Now the trader's loyalty to His Lord's will, and the abundance of Grace as moral dynamic, which is the reward of fidelity, is only another way of stating the experience of those who were sown on good ground, and were producing results according to the measure of their fidelity to that which was sown in them, some thirty-fold, some sixty, some a hundred. On the other hand, the man who received the talent and went and hid it in the earth reminds us of those that are sown among the thorns, who are indifferent, irresponsible, lacking any element of adventure, who for a moment hear the word, " and the cares of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word and it becometh unfruitful."

We conclude, then, that in the parables of the Sower, the silently growing Seed, the Pounds and the Talents, there is taught the fact of the ' given,' the objective reality of divine Grace. This ' given ' reality becomes through faith an immanent divine energy, growing as faith grows ; and it is transmuted into ethical values by the individual, and through him for society. If such moral results are not explicitly attributed to divine action in the soul as in Phil. 2. 12 f., these parables and logia cannot be explained apart from such action. They teach under other forms than the Epistles that Christian Ethics presupposes Christian Grace. They teach the kingdom of God to be a present gift, also a present task. Yea, it is the gift which creates the task and inspires its achievement.

6. *The Hidden Treasure and Pearl*

Matt. 13. 44–46

The parables of the Hidden Treasure and Pearl state the psychological effect of the discovery of the kingdom on men. One man finds treasure in the field unexpectedly. The merchant is out on a definite quest, and such seekers are of

the kingdom of God, sure to find in the end the Pearl of great price. The kingdom is not said to be given in this case. The Treasure and the Pearl are objective realities and are discovered, not created by the two men. The psychosis which led to the discovery of the kingdom is not our concern. It is enough to point out that the finding of the Treasure and the Pearl is a new fact in the self-consciousness of the two men. The emphasis of the parables lies in the objective control of this new fact upon them both. They are conscious of having discovered treasures, which for them far transcend all others in life. At the same time, they are conscious that these objective values are not yet their own. They are unable to possess them completely the moment they discover them. They apprehend, but they do not attain. In each case, however, that which is found, fascinates and moves the will, until it becomes the controlling motive of life, leading to complete renunciation, and urging effort to effect complete acquisition. When men are conscious of the values of the kingdom, these two parables point out the strenuous application which follows, in order to make them permanent for the self. In other words, the kingdom is an objective reality which men discover, and which makes a constant challenge to, and continually stimulates their will. In view of previous teaching on the kingdom it is possible to express the Treasure and the Pearl in terms of spiritual experience. When men find the kingdom they find forgiveness and the Grace of God. And such realities become creative energies, inspiring them to fulfil the ideal of the kingdom, and urging them to that goal with which the glory of their career is identified.

CHAPTER II

GRACE AND MOTIVE

A. The Sinner in the City

Luke 7. 36–50 (cf. *Mark* 14. 3–9; *Matt.* 26. 6–13)

IN the case of the woman who was in the city, a sinner, our Lord attributes a specific Christian virtue to His grace.[1] To make the woman's forgiveness the reward of love, or in any sense the compensation of merit, as Roman Catholic commentators mostly do, is alien to the whole teaching of Jesus. It is reversing the spiritual order of all Christian experience. The Reformers held that the Romish doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works was one of the two ideas which destroyed the very basis of Christianity. The Romish idea finds no support in Luke's narrative. Our Lord shews that the forgiveness of the two debtors was the motive of their love to him who forgave. He further explained that the woman's forgiveness and her act of love had no immediate time sequence. On some occasion previous to her act of anointing she had entered into a personal relationship with Christ through faith,[2] and in that experience she had found the forgiveness of her sins. It was that fact which explained her devotion in Simon's house. It will not be disputed that the object of her faith, as also the object of her love, was Jesus. Hence, Jesus initiated the consciousness of forgiveness which in turn evoked love to Himself. His Grace was transmuted

[1] Luke 7. 42–43, *charizesthai*, to shew oneself gracious: to forgive freely.

[2] *v*, 50.

into motive, the character of which was revealed in the woman's love towards Him. We now arrive at an experience in the Synoptic gospels in which love is directly ascribed by Jesus to the operation of His own Grace.

Again, Jesus points out a reciprocity between the measure of the experience of forgiveness and the love manifested. Not that the consciousness of Grace is decided by degrees of sinfulness. It is decided by what Christ does, not by what human nature is. It is Grace which evokes penitence, although no word on penitence is found in this narrative. Our Lord is pointing out in verses 43, 47 how essentially ethical His Grace is. In the woman it had an expulsive and an impulsive effect. The consciousness of forgiveness *was* a break with her past, but it was also an urge onwards. The synoptists always regard forgiveness as having immediate psychological effects in those who experience it. This is manifest in the use of *aphesis* to express forgiveness as an experience of releasing, not merely from the guilt of sin, but also from the will to sin.[1] Forgiveness cannot be limited in its effects to that which is past : in true spiritual experience it never is. When God forgives He does not simply cause something which existed to become non-existent. Our Lord illustrated the perils of this view by the case of the unclean spirit which returned and found its own house unoccupied, whereon it went and found seven other spirits more diabolical than itself. This woman had a past, and the Grace of Jesus released the grip of this past until it no longer paralysed her will. Still, His Grace did not merely arrest the will to sin ; it was more positive than that. It was a continuous impulse within her to love Himself. Jesus invariably stated, in one form or another, the positive and permanent demands of His Grace, shewing that it had the utmost significance for character and service. Forgiveness is real in its blotting out of guilt, but it is also a mighty ethical dynamic in the heart.

This is one of the few statements in the Synoptic gospels of the soul's love to Christ, and such love is the virtue of

[1] *Aphienai* 37 times in the Synoptics, *Aphesis* 8 times.

virtues. When the Fourth gospel came to be written, Christian mysticism had found this virtue to be rooted in the soul's union with the Living Lord. This is explicitly set forth in the parable of the Vine. Likewise, Paul's love for Christ was rooted in Christ's love for Paul. As the Apostle said, Christ's love constrained him.[1] In the Synoptic gospels this truth is set forth implicitly and under other forms. This woman's love for the Master, for instance, shews that such experience was real, even during the ministry. In the preceding chapter we dealt with the psychological effects in men, of the Grace of God through Jesus, and if no definite virtues are mentioned, as in the present instance, the nature of the experience must be explained by the same objective reality that explains the woman's love. B. Weiss thinks that, in general, Jesus kept the commandment of love to God in the background of His teaching, because it was necessary that we should realize that our love to God must have its motive in God's love to us, and to demand the love of man to God, " where that motive does not of itself work its fulfilment . . . would be of no virtue."[2] In other words, Jesus was not so explicit in stating the relation of Grace to Ethics, because it was little use doing so until He had explained the nature of His Father's love as motive. It was necessary to present the objective character of the Father's Grace before He could explain explicitly the effects of such Grace in subjective experience.

We conclude, then, that Luke 7. 36–50 records an incident which is typical of all true Christian life. In the woman, and in the parable of the two debtors, the subjective effect of divine Grace in the heart is presented as love evoked by forgiveness. Behind the act of anointing was the motive inspired by Grace. *But Jesus judged personality in the terms of motive. Hence the stupendous significance of His Grace for His Ethic.* In numerous ways motive may be thwarted, it may only partially achieve its goal, but Christian motive

[1] 2 Cor. 5. 14.
[2] *Bib. Theol. N. T.*, II, 114, see footnote.

has absolute value for Christian Ethics. If in other instances in the Synoptic gospels the relation between divine Grace and human motive is less clearly stated than in this incident, it is claimed that they are nevertheless present as the objective and subjective aspects of all experience which grows out of relationship with Jesus. It is impossible to separate the objective and subjective aspects in the unity of Christian experience, for they are never present except in relation to each other. To do so for the purpose of discussion has its risks. Not a few writers on Christian Ethics have failed in their system-making by paying too little attention to the objective side of all Christian Ethic. In reality Jesus has no ethical system. Every attempt to give system to His Ethics will appear artificial unless His Grace is brought out as the inspiration of motive. He brought to men a new consciousness of God, through which the will was inspired to create its own methods, as is done by the woman who had been a sinner in the city.[1]

B. Divine Grace and Human Forgiveness

We turn now to the teaching of Jesus which states the closest possible relation between divine and human forgiveness. In the passage relating to this subject in the Lord's Prayer, Matthew has the characteristic Jewish conception of sin as a debt to God, while Luke uses the ordinary synoptic word *hamartia*. Like the First evangelist, however, Luke has the concept of debt when viewing sin on its human side. Forgiveness, free and gracious, is thus contrasted with human obligation to God.

Our Lord's Prayer states divine and human forgiveness as inseparable aspects of experience within the kingdom. The Grace of God does not bring forgiveness to the soul before a man forgives his debtors. Nor does man forgive those

[1] What Jesus is to the experience of this woman, the death of Christ is to the experience of justification and sanctification as explained by Paul. In both cases forgiveness is the dynamic of ethics.

who have wronged Him in order to receive divine forgiveness. The forgiveness is immediate in each case. Of course, after divine forgiveness, the will to forgive is morally necessary to the continued enjoyment of Grace, but this only states the impossibility of separating divine and human forgiveness. Because a man has forgiven his brother he has no claim before God. In this matter man has no claim whatever of any kind. When he receives the Grace of God, at that very moment, the divine operation in his heart is one with his forgiveness of his penitent brother. Matthew accentuated this ethical view of forgiveness by a positive and negative statement of its objective and subjective operations. "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."[1] Divine Grace cannot be abstracted from human grace.

The unlimited scope of inspired human forgiveness is seen in our Lord's answer to the question of Peter; "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him?" It is made clearer still in the parable of the Unforgiving Servant which illustrates the ethical implications of divine forgiveness.[2] The only hindrance to forgiveness is said to be ethical; for as God cannot forgive unless man repents, neither can man forgive unless his brother repents. This is deliberately stated by Luke.[3] Under circumstances when impenitence is the settled mood of the offender the attitude of man to man is to be that of the Providence of God, who makes His sun to rise on the evil and the good. But granted such an ethical condition as repentance, the forgiveness of man must be as gracious as the forgiveness of God. "Until seventy times seven" is a figurative way for expressing the unlimited and generous flow of unearned grace from man to the penitent brother he forgives. The parable is most instructive for the problem it sets on the human level. Can we receive forgiveness, either from God or man, and yet withhold

[1] Matt. 6. 14–15. [2] Matt. 18. 15–35.
[3] Luke 17. 3 f.; cf. Matt. 18. 17.

the same from others who are penitent ? The servant who owed ten thousand talents and was forgiven, enjoyed for a brief space immunity from his debts ; it was long enough to enable him to seize the penitent debtor who owed him a hundred pence and promised to pay the debt. When the Lord of the forgiven but unforgiving servant heard it he cancelled the condition of forgiveness and reinstated that of the original obligation. The parable is full of significance, most of all for the ethical nature of that experience which is *not* membership in the kingdom.

It is impossible to receive forgiveness from the Lord of the kingdom and withhold it from another penitent soul. In the very nature of Christian experience the man who is forgiven by God must also forgive. For the purpose of shewing the essentially moral character of forgiveness by God, our Lord stated a chronological sequence in which a state of forgiveness by the Master of the servant preceded a glaring failure on the servant's part to forgive. But when the parable represents the debtor to the extent of ten thousand talents as forgiven, even at that moment, his motive must have been uncharitable to the debtor who owed him a hundred pence ; and His intention needed but the earliest opportunity to lead him to act as he did. This raises the issue : can a man be forgiven when his innermost nature is uncharged toward those whom *he* ought to forgive ? This parable would seem to furnish an instance where the experience of forgiveness belonged to an unforgiving heart, or where Grace failed to urge the will to be gracious. If so, the parable would at once refute any deterministic conception of Grace ; for in such a case the man would have forgiven, as he had received forgiveness. The parable, however, is meant to shew the impossibility within the kingdom of the experience which it sets forth. The Grace of God is an objective reality which is known by the forgiven heart, but such Grace is not deterministic, for then it would be unethical. The parable shews that on the part of God and man the freedom to forgive is real, but it also shews that in the very nature of forgiveness itself, there

cannot be any ethical antagonism between the Will of God and that of man. In conjunction with other teaching in the Synoptic gospels, this parable explains, though in a negative way, the unity of that spiritual experience which is demanded of those within the kingdom. To be forgiven involves the condition of heart which forgives as freely as it has received. That the merciless act cancelled the condition of mercy to the ungenerous servant must not be overlooked. Were it possible to say that Grace was received which failed to constrain the will, it would be possible to answer that such failure cancelled Grace. In other words, Grace cannot contradict its own moral nature by unforgiving deeds towards others. The verse which interprets the parable at the close is decisive on this point.

In the foregoing passages there is such an intimate reciprocity between divine and human forgiveness that our Lord represents them as the objective and subjective aspects of Christian experience. There is an inner contradiction in supposing that a man can receive from God for himself that which he denies to others. The will to be forgiven cannot be abstracted from the will to forgive. Is it possible to have more conclusive evidence of the subjective effect of the Grace of Jesus ? This effect is wrought in the deeps of human personality and is seen in the immediate character of the motive which is fundamental in Christian Ethics. And this was the truth which Jesus taught His disciples. He was describing experience in which His own Will to forgive and the will of man to forgive are both free, and both active. It is impossible to account for such experience as we have reviewed unless we say that such subjective activity belongs to the immediate control of divine Grace as objective in Jesus.

The problem of divine and human forgiveness was not unknown to Judaism. There is a most remarkable passage on the subject in the Testament of Gad. " Love ye, therefore, one another from the heart ; and if a man sin against thee cast forth the poison of hate and speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile ; and if he confess and repent, forgive

him."[1] There are Christian interpolations in the Testaments, but since the foregoing passage is found in the Armenian version, Charles sees no reason to regard it as a Christian addition. He judges it to be "a unique passage in ancient literature on the subject of forgiveness. So perfect are the parallels in thought and diction between these verses and Luke 17. 3; Matthew 18. 15–35, that we must assume our Lord's acquaintance with them."[2]

There is undoubtedly in these early views of the Chasids the promise of a noble system of ethics which the subsequent history of the party failed to realize. But why were these views so sterile within Judaism itself? The answer is furnished in the Testaments, even in that of Gad, noble as is its antidote for the patriarch's own surrender to hatred.[3] It attests the popularity of the *lex talionis*:[4] 'My children,'[5] and, 'your children,'[6] indicate that the precepts of Gad were to be taught to Jewish posterity alone. At any rate, on no ground can it be affirmed that divine and human forgiveness were demanded by the Jewish Church as the essential unity of spiritual experience, while, on the other hand, Charles says that in the New Testament "these two forgivenesses are seen to be one and the same."[7] The root difficulty with Judaism was its doctrine of God and man and their relation. By holding firmly to such doctrines Judaism was prevented from yielding to a true universalism without ceasing itself to exist. The fundamental doctrine in religion is that of God, and as long as the Jewish theory of the Holiness of God prevailed the static view of Grace prevailed.[8] But the Christian Ethic of forgiveness rests on a dynamic conception of Grace. The teaching on divine and human forgiveness in the Synoptic gospels cannot be explained if the dynamic of a new spiritual

[1] Test. Gad 6. 3–7. See Commentary, *in loco.*; cf. 5. 5, Oxford Edition; cf. Intro. of this work, p. 30.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 293. [3] T. Gad, ch. 3.
[4] 5. 10. [5] 6. 1. [6] 8. 1.
[7] On Forgiveness in Testaments see Charles, 293, also his note on Test. Benj. 9. 2, Oxford Edition.
[8] See p. 21 f.

relationship with God through Jesus is overlooked. When Jesus revealed God as Father, and taught that forgiveness, divine and human, was inseparable, something wrought in personal fellowship between God and the soul, He was teaching a Doctrine of God which involved a complete transformation of the Jewish Doctrine of Man. Forgiveness was of Grace, free, and mediated through Jesus, who objectified the Father's Grace, and when a man sought from God forgiveness for his own sins, he was not alone in his search ; even as he knelt to pray, he carried his own debtors in his heart, and they knelt as it were at his side, and in one profound spiritual experience of divine Grace he was forgiven and he forgave.

CHAPTER III

GRACE AND OUR LORD'S TEACHING ON PRAYER

A. Prayer and Inspired Motive

DIVINE and human forgiveness have the closest relation to our Lord's teaching on Prayer. The petition concerning forgiveness, divine and human, is part of the Lord's Prayer itself. The Matthean Logia, the sayings on the unlimited character of forgiveness, the parable of the Unforgiving Servant, are no more than expansions of its principle. Mark sets this Ethic in relation to the teaching on prayer: "And whensoever ye stand praying forgive, if ye have aught against any one."[1] Prayer and worship are impossible under any other conditions: "First be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift."[2] These passages shew that prayer has its own ethical demands, and is useless unless they are fulfilled.

Now the synoptists record experience which *was real at the time*, and which was attributed by Jesus to the interaction of the personalities of the Father and His child. They do not express the subjective effect of prayer in such terms as the Epistle to the Hebrews, or Paul; at the same time, they never abstract the ethical character of forgiveness from prayer-experience, and their language on the subject is emphatic and explicit. When dealing with divine and human forgiveness the Synoptic gospels present them as belonging to the unity of Christian experience, which is profoundest and richest in ethical promise when the soul is at prayer. In such moments

[1] Mark 11. 35. [2] Matt. 23. 24.

there is direct reciprocity of action between Father and child, so that, while the latter is most completely surrendered to God, he is most vividly conscious of his own individuality and freedom. In this reciprocity of action the motive of the Father passes into and controls the motive of His child. Hence, Christian prayer makes the sternest of demands on the whole of the human personality. But if the Father's claim on the will of His child is so awful, it is only that He may inspire it to do His own Will. "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth," can be no merely pious hope of the soul at prayer. It can only mean that in the reciprocal activity set up through prayer, the Will of the Father controls the will of the son. It is significant that in such moments the child is conscious of his greatest tasks, and of the Father's unfathomable resources to achieve them. "It is the sublime significance of prayer that it brings into prominence man's great and high destiny, that it heightens his consciousness of his true moral nature in relation to God; and as morality depends on our relation to God, prayer is the very life-blood of morality."[1]

B. Prayer as a Means of Grace

Our Lord teaches that prayer is vital to the tasks which are set the disciples. On several occasions He teaches that faith and the will to pray lead to the highest development of the individual character, also to permanent social progress. The faith which removes mountains is related by the first two evangelists to prayer.[2] Given faith, then the Grace of God becomes immanent for the soul. In other words, faith and prayer are means of divine Grace to the end of accomplishing the divine purpose. To remove mountains is figurative of all that hurls challenge and defiance at the will of God. The phrase is expressive of the most stupendous task which confronts the Christian as an individual, or the disciples as a

[1] Wuttke, *Christian Ethics*, Vol. II, 221.
[2] Matt. 21. 21 f.; Mc. 11. 23 ff.; cf. Received Text, Matt. 17. 20 f.

society. No such task, however, is impossible to the soul that has learnt to receive the Grace of God through faith and prayer. The failure of the disciples to cure the epileptic boy was attributed by Jesus to their failure in prayer. On the other hand, He encouraged the father of the boy by saying that all things were possible to him who believed.[1] "Our Lord must have spoken much," says Inge, "of the moral force of Faith, of what is now sometimes called the dynamic of religion."[2] And the consciousness of this dynamic was most profound, when the soul was at prayer.

The parables of the Friend at Midnight and of the Unjust Judge deal with the will to persist in prayer in face of delayed realization of the object sought. They teach that the objective reality of divine Grace is no mere convenience for men who think they pray, requesting material gifts for material ends : the goodness of God is no arbitrary way of escape from some desperate crisis in the midnight of the soul. The parables suggest that prayer is a prolonged and sustained wrestle ; and they shew that we have to wait for the rule of the kingdom in ourselves and others, and that it is worth while to pray as we wait.[3] Persistence in itself had no merit such as Judaism taught ; but it does inspire the child's trust in the Father as one who is free to fulfil His purposes according to His own moral demands in His own time. It often occurs that prayer which is directed to the most spiritual ends is in advance of that moral condition which is essential for its own answer. That is, the difficulty of delay, in one sense, is most pronounced to him who prays best. When communion with God is most intense, it is concerned with clear spiritual vision and thought, with holy emotion, and with attainment within the realm of spiritual ends. It is, however, precisely here—the realization in concrete ethical results of the will of God on earth—that delay grows perplexing. The individual is conscious of the fact in relation to his own spiritual progress. He is more restless still at the delay of establishing the kingdom of love in

[1] Mc. 9. 29. [2] *Faith and its Psychology*, 9.
[3] See Bruce, *Ex. G. T.*, 547.

this present world order. For himself, his prayers are far ahead of what he is and attains ; and even when his impulses are strongest to do the will of Christ, his ideal is ever in advance of his achievement. But the will that continues to endure in prayer is inspired by Grace, through the reciprocity of action with the will of the Father.

Jesus is most positive and emphatic that the Grace of God never mocks the persistent prayer of men, even when the objective reality of the goodness of God has not complete control of the subjective activity of one, or all. It is difficult to grasp our Lord's certainty of Grace in prayer-experience. He knew that in such experience the will was not only in contact with Reality, but was inspired and moved by it. Asking, seeking, and knocking, must obtain the " good things " which the Father in heaven graciously bestows. We must make no mistake, however, concerning the spiritual realm to which these " good things " are integral.[1] Luke defines them in the term of the Holy Spirit. But, as we have seen, to receive the Holy Spirit is to receive power, or to be clothed with power. Further, this superhuman power is graciously given for the realization of the purpose of God in and through him who receives it ; and such power becomes in turn the dynamic of obedience to the will of the Father. This is immanent divine Grace.

Now the Father's good pleasure to give the Holy Spirit has everything to do with the will to pray on the one hand, and the solution of delay on the other. He who through prayer receives the Holy Spirit has solved all problems of delay in other matters, for there is no delay by the Father in granting the Holy Spirit to His children. The Grace of the Father in giving the Holy Spirit is sufficient for all needs, and leads to further reciprocal spiritual activity between Father and child in prayer. True prayer is an experience which distils enough dew to refresh and invigorate the soul for further fellowship. It is in this way that prayer solves the ethics of delay, inspiring patience and even per-

[1] Matt. 7. 7 ff. ; Luke 11. 13.

sistence, since the practice of prayer is the means of Grace for the perfection of both. The great illustration in the New Testament is Paul's prayer for the removal of the thorn in his flesh. The thorn is not removed, but the Grace of God does not mock Paul, it inspires him to bear his thorn. The Synoptists do not use the same terms to describe God's answer to prayer ; but they teach very clearly that in communion with God the soul is inspired through the inflow of the Divine life itself. Through prayer as a means, Grace inspires ethical progress.

Our Lord further taught His disciples to pray, "lead us not into temptation." In such prayer, the soul appeals to God for the objective control of its own subjective activity, such as will keep it immune from temptation. It is an aspiration that Grace may have a continuous and positive ethical effect on the will ; that Grace may direct the will to those objects which allow temptation no ground of appeal. The objective value of prayer is thus seen in the operation of divine Grace which keeps the soul from peril of sinning. The subjective effects of this prayer, when it is answered, is, that "none of the saints fails to keep his perseverance in holiness even to the end. For there is not anyone who ceases to persevere in the Christian purpose unless he is first of all led into temptation. If, therefore, it be granted to him according to his prayer that he may not be led (into temptation), certainly by the gift of God he persists in that sanctification which by the gift of God he has received."[1]

Further, in our Lord's exhortation to the disciples who had slept through His vigil in the garden,[2] watchfulness and prayer are a preventive against temptation. The alertness of the spirit was explained as necessary in view of the weakness of the flesh. Watchfulness is not said to be due to prayer, but such constant spiritual alertness partakes of the experience of prayer itself. In view of the circumstances under which this logion was uttered, our Lord surely meant to impress on the

[1] Augustine, *On the Gift of Perseverance*, ch. 9.
[2] Mc. 14. 38 ; Matt. 26. 41.

disciples the stupendous demands of their spiritual calling upon the will. They had slept when it was no time to do so. Temptation had overcome them, and their failure was that of the will. From what they knew of His own example and instruction on prayer, they should learn that through communion with God an access of divine power came to the will, such as led to victory over the weakness of the flesh. The ethical nature of the vigil which Christ laid upon His followers is more pronounced still at the close of the eschatological discourse. "Take ye heed, watch." Several MSS. of Mark's text associate prayer with this constant vigilance.[1] Luke, clearly influenced by Paul, in the passage in the eschatological discourse, urges watchfulness with "supplication, that ye may prevail to escape all those things which shall come to pass and to stand before the Son of Man."[2] Such prayer is a means of divine Grace, the subjective effect of which is an alert spiritual condition.

C. Place of Jesus in His Teaching on Prayer

We have pointed out the significance of prayer for the life and death of Jesus Himself. What was His place in the teaching on prayer that we have just examined? We have seen that prayer in the Synoptic gospels is an experience which is morally conditioned, uniquely so; and this conception, which was revealed by Jesus, the objective Personification of divine Grace, was not known apart from Him. It is true that He directs men to pray to His Father and does not command them to pray to Himself. But the cumulative evidence so far available, plus the meaning of such passages as Matthew 18. 20, where He promises that two or three who pray in His name shall be heard, and Luke 10. 17, Mark 9. 38, 39, where the devils are subject to the disciples through *His name*, are sufficient to account for the emphasis in the Fourth gospel that prayer must be offered "in His name." It is impossible

[1] Mark 13. 33. Some MSS. add "and pray." [2] Luke 21. 36.

to divorce Jesus from those ethical energies which rise into consciousness through prayer-experience in the Synoptic gospels. We have seen how men besought Him as one whose compassion and power were equal to any emergency which faith made upon them. This fact has considerable bearing on the place of Jesus in the communion of man and God, even in the days of the Ministry. He was the unique revelation of divine Grace, and this unique revelation means more than a setting forth of an ideal, it must carry in its bosom unique power which makes the ideal possible of attainment. Now the disciples found this power in personal contact with Jesus, and such personal contact *was* prayer-experience.

Unless this were so, unless direct subjective results, profoundly ethical, were due to personal contact and communion between Jesus and the disciples, such chapters as John 14.–16., and the High Priestly Prayer of chapter 17.—notably such verses as 8, 10, 12, 19, 23, 26—could not be satisfactorily explained. On the ethical side—and such a side is vital in any attempt to explain the development of doctrine in the New Testament, though the weight of the moral argument has been often underestimated and ignored—there is no suggestion of dualism between the Synoptic gospels and the rest of the New Testament, concerning the source of the subjective experience of Grace. The new source of moral energy rises into consciousness in the historic days of the Ministry, and it flows through the same men into Apostolic times and achievements. The conception of that source becomes modified, but it is the deepening of experience which began with the historic Jesus which modifies later views of His Person. It was through such channels that Paul received his Gospel, how that Christ died for our sins. Hence we conclude that it is " the Synoptic, the pre-Pauline tradition, which contains the fuller arsenal of the spiritual forces which have transfigured and still inspire the world of Soul."[1] Jesus is central and inspirational to all the experience of the disciples, such as we now describe as prayer-life.

[1] Von Hugel, *The Mystical Element in Religion*, II, 120.

The synoptic passages which suggest that our Lord taught the truth of corporate spiritual life should not be forgotten in this connection. The opening address of the Lord's Prayer, 'Our Father,' is distinctly suggestive of corporate prayer. If Matthew 18. 20 is late, it corresponds to the inspiration of the Personality of Jesus in such works as exorcism, and mutual service. Such parables as the Mustard Seed and the Leaven clearly teach the development of the corporate life of the disciples. The parable of the Judgment of the Nations also teaches the social nature of the Christian Ethic; and in view of such facts it is reasonable to assume that Jesus urged upon the disciples the necessity of corporate prayer as vital to the progress of the kingdom. It is also reasonable to assume that Jesus regarded Himself as essential to this corporate prayer-life, in the same way that He regarded Himself as essential to the progress of the kingdom.

D. Evolution and Christian Prayer

In his discussion of the place of prayer in religion Jevons draws attention to the remarkable fact that while "the whole apparatus of religion, rites, and ceremonies, sacrifice and altars, nature worship and polytheism, has been investigated; the one thing overlooked has been the one thing for the sake of which all the others exist, the prayer in which man's soul rises, or seeks to rise, to God."[1] He then quotes Professor Tylor to the effect that the nature of prayer is so simple and familiar, "that its study does not demand that detail of fact and argument which must be given to rites in comparison, practically insignificant."[1] The History of Religion shews that there is no religious experience which is not some form of man's communion with his God. It is a contradiction in terms to speak of religious experience in which there is no consciousness of a Superior Being. Jevons points out that in primitive religion this consciousness is most

[1] *Intro. to the Study of Comparative Religion*, 141.

pronounced in the prayers of the community. But such prayers also reveal the standard of morality which obtains in the community, and satisfies the demands of its God. So that, in the History of Religion, prayer is a safe index to morality. On regular and irregular occasions when the community resorts to prayer, it is the desire of the community which the God is expected to grant. Should such request be unrealized for any prolonged period the community exchanges its God for another. In primitive religion, then, the uppermost thing in prayer is the desire of the tribe. This means that in the unity of religious experience the subjective seeks to control the objective with a view to securing its own ends. The God is asked to grant the desires, and uphold the customary morality of the tribe. There is so-called Christian prayer which rises no higher than this view—the prayer which is nothing less than the attempt of man to get his own desires and customary ethic recognized by God.

What Jevons says of prayer and religion in general is true in many respects of prayer and Christianity in particular. The relation of prayer to the Ethic of Jesus has been a greatly neglected theme. The synoptists record such vital relation between prayer and sacrifice in the life of Jesus, and shew that He was the supreme example of prayer as a means of Grace, that the necessity of prayer-experience for His followers ought to be beyond question. Yet, even in Christianity, while the subject of prayer is not estimated as unimportant, it is often regarded as so simple and familiar that it does not call for or receive that investigation of fact and detail which is given to other things in comparison practically insignificant.

Now the method of evolution has been used to shew that Christian prayer can be explained as the highest form of that communion which man has always been seeking with some Superior Being. This reasoning, however, makes prayer too subjective, and assumes that the Christian Doctrines of God and Man can also be accounted for by the evolutionary method. Obviously these are the doctrines which must finally

decide the nature of prayer-experience, for prayer is relation between man and his God. As an instance of the reasoning in question, Pfleiderer finds that a number of poets and religious leaders, of varied nationalities, have used the word 'father' of their God.[1] He then concludes that the word 'Father' was not something new on the lips of Jesus. But such a conclusion is not reached by the evolutionary method of religion. An argument of this kind perverts every canon of interpretation. Every term must be interpreted by the universe of reasoning in which it is used. When this is done, what relation has Zeus as father, with his magnified human lusts, to the Father of Jesus Christ? The problem of Monotheism, still less our Lord's Doctrine of God as Father, cannot be begged in this way.

Again, the Christian Doctrine of Man has nothing in common with the irreconcilable dualism of Indian and Greek Philosophy. The dualism of Greek thinkers, whether it be examined in Plato, or the Stoics, or the mysticism of Plotinus, leads to a Doctrine of Man which is not only not Christian, but distinctly anti-Christian. The "redemption of the body" is something which neither Indian nor Greek Philosophy knows anything about.

We cannot pursue these comparisons further at this point. If, however, we cannot account for the Christian Doctrines of God and Man by the evolutionary method, and we cannot, is it likely that the same method can explain the nature of Christian communion, the experience in which God and Christ and men are conscious of reciprocal activities? The truth is that Jesus lifts prayer into a new sphere, where Christian aspiration springs from a new source, namely, the Grace of the Father. There is an evolution in Christian prayer itself which is determined by man's continuous choice of the Father's will. The fact we wish to bring out, however, is that the source of Christian prayer is supernatural and not natural; that it rises out of the Father's quest for man in Christ, not out of

[1] Pfleiderer, *Origins*, 96.

man's quest for God. "With the most earnest and unfeigned desire to use the theory of evolution as a means of ordering the facts of the history of religion and of enabling us—so far as it can enable us—to understand them, one is bound to notice as a fact, that the theory of evolution is unable to account for or explain the revelation, made in our Lord's Prayer, of the spirit which is both human and divine."[1] What is it that cannot be explained by such a theory? It is the doctrine of the Father's Grace, the great *differentia* between Christian and non-Christian Religions; also the Christian (or inspired) Ethic, which the Prayer assumes as a psychological effect of the same Grace.

Our Lord's Prayer was given to the disciples out of His own experience of unbroken communion with God. It is concerned, as all prayers of Jesus are concerned, with the realization of the will of God in life and work. And in order to be Christian, prayer must be concerned with the Father's will. Prayer is not the 'desire' of the individual nor of the community. Desire is not will. Inclination is not motive. Neither desire nor inclination reach up to purpose. Prayer is no breathing forth of mere pious wishes. It is concerned with the great redemptive purpose of the Father in history: with His will through Christ to seek and to save the lost, and with the control of our will to the same goal. Hence, in the Christian religion prayer is not the one thing for the sake of which all others exist. It is no final end in itself. It does not view the individual as the end of his own prayer. Prayer shows that the end of man is related to the will of God, and that human personality is the means through which the Divine will works in society. Christian prayer is inseparable from Christian socialism—the realization of that society which is called into existence by, and embodies in its own life, the will of God. Whatever form prayer takes, then, whether it be praise, meditation, or direct-petition, it is itself controlled by Grace, and it ought to further in us, and through us, the eternal and

[1] Jevons, *ibid.*, 173.

gracious motive of the Father. It is a 'means' of Grace, where, in the reciprocity of activity between the soul and God, the former is conscious of receiving power to become, and power to achieve.

A word of warning will not be out of place against modern utilitarian methods which deal with Christian prayer and seek to shew by results that it is really worth while. There is a psychological method which seeks to analyse the experiences in which objects were asked for, and received. But Christian prayer is never an experiment in any sense of the word. If it were it would be magic and not prayer. No satisfactory Doctrine of Prayer can rest on the tabulated results of the individual or the community. Nor do such results really lead others to pray. Prayer produces results which may lead the soul that receives them to pray on, but that is due to the experience of the reciprocity of spiritual forces in prayer which issue in ethical values. The best results of prayer are those which pass into the marrow and muscle of the moral life of the individual and society, and these are not surface results, nor easily tabulated. When analytical psychology has done its best to sort out and label the reciprocal spiritual energies between God and man which operate in Christian prayer, its conclusion may be useful, just as the chart of the Gulf Stream is useful to the navigator. Prayer, however, is an experience of the gulf-stream of Grace itself, and the best argument for prayer is to be carried on its bosom.

Again, Psychical Research may easily side-track the Christian, until he loses himself in the mysteries of psychical problems as a river loses itself in the sand. The Christian Doctrine of Prayer may receive help from these studies, but neither its sanction nor its results rest on any such thing. The possibility or otherwise of communication with the unseen neither raises nor settles the moral issues which are vital to prayer as it is seen in the life and teaching of Jesus. Christian Prayer is more than communication with a Spiritual Being or Beings; it is morally conditioned on the one hand, it

is the mightiest means for the achievement of moral results on the other. In other words, in prayer, divine Grace sustains man's spiritual life, inspiring him to become not what he has always been in germ, but what God wills him to be. That this inflow of divine Grace might never fail men, Jesus urged them always to pray and not to faint.

CHAPTER IV

GRACE AND THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

UP to the present we have not dealt with that part of our Lord's teaching which distinctly sets forth His Ethical Ideal. We have been concerned to bring out the synoptic evidence for those psychological processes in which thought, emotion and will are absorbing and working out the dynamic of divine Grace, objective in Jesus. Such activities as faith and hearing, accepting and holding fast the Word, and bringing forth fruit in preaching, healing, exorcising unclean spirits, in love and in forgiveness, have been shewn to be prompted and inspired by the Grace of God in Jesus. It has been found impossible to abstract these processes and activities, along with their ethical results, from the creative Personality of the Master. We proceed now, in the light of such conclusions, to examine our Lord's direct ethical teaching. In doing so, we shall assume, pointing out further evidence as we proceed, that our Lord regarded Himself as indispensable to the attainment of His Ethical Ideal; that He personally inspired men to achieve His Ethic; that Christian Grace is set forth in synoptic evidence, so far considered, as the only basis for Christian Ethics. In other words, Christian Ethics cannot be abstracted from the subjective aspect of Grace.

Luke says that after the selection of the Twelve from a larger number of followers, our Lord came down from the mountain and uttered His Sermon to a great number of disciples. How this statement affects the various problems which arise from a comparison of the Sermon in Luke and in

the First gospel does not concern us. Luke's remark is important, however, since it relates the Sermon to our Lord's previous teaching and work. It has an historical setting which presupposes an experience in the disciples, such as had its source in personal fellowship with Jesus. The attempt to give strict chronological sequence to our Lord's teaching is made difficult by the grouping method of the First evangelist, but there is no doubt that the Sermon assumes membership in the kingdom as essential to its attainment, and then proceeds to unfold the nature and fulness of the kingdom's Ethical Ideal. "Since this discourse lays down principles of conduct for discipleship, the discipleship must have been previously established in other ways."[1]

A. The Beatitudes

For the understanding and attainment of the beatific ideals, our Lord's use of *makarios* is vital. It involves a relation with God, without which the Master's ideal cannot be reached. It eulogises that experience in which man is the recipient of divine Grace—the immanent inspirational energy of the poor in spirit, the pure in heart and the meek. It is not a condition which is consequent on hunger and thirst after righteousness, or love of peace. Blessedness is at the heart of that experience which initiates hunger and thirst, and all such aspirations. It is true that *makarios* becomes a richer and deeper experience as the beatific ideals are realized, and in that sense may be described as a subjective result, due to loyalty to subjective Grace. But it refers, says Votaw, "to that condition of true well-being which results from committing oneself wholly to God, with the purpose of living according to His Will; it connotes also the effect produced by this status."[2] Blessedness, then, is the condition of the heart in which Grace already reigns: it is a term which eulogises membership in the

[1] Adeney, *D. C. G.*, II, 612. [2] *D. B.*, Vol. V. 17.

kingdom. Hence, the attainment of the ideal of the Sermon is impossible apart from the subjective experience which is blessedness, which Jesus initiated. The subjective aspect of divine Grace will be manifest, therefore, in those moral effects which are achieved as the will evolves the potentialities of being already *makarios*. This becomes clear when the Beatitudes are considered in detail.[1]

To be poor in spirit is to depend completely upon divine Grace, and he who does so depend possesses the kingdom. To rely upon God's Grace is to have the subjective experience which is possession of the kingdom in this life.

Whether mourning means penitence, or the sorrow and disappointment which come to all who work towards the ideal of Jesus, it presupposes an experience apart from which neither penitence nor dismay can have any meaning. Sorrow for sin is a certain psychological and moral effect of the Grace of God in Jesus. There is also a solid background to Christian disappointment. In fact, when defeat is deep enough to be Christian, it is rooted in an experience of divine Grace, such as leads one to mark the contrast between the Christian ideal and the condition which already exists, between that which ' is ' and the Christian ' ought.' There is blessedness at the heart of the penitent, for Grace explains his penitence. There is blessedness at the heart of that man whose fidelity has seemed unsuccessful, for the Grace of God produces that subjective experience which helps him to take the true measure of failure.

The third Beatitude can be interpreted best through Jesus who was meek and lowly of heart. In Him we discern the measure of the progress of this Beatitude over similar statements in the Old Testament. His relation to the Father was that of meekness. His consciousness of dependence, His prayers, His Will to do His Father's purpose, are a revelation of this meekness. It must be pointed out that the meekness of Jesus was not something negative, the absence of pride, or

[1] For our purpose we follow the Matthean version. Luke links the Beatific Ideal on the one hand with Judgment on the other.

the absence of the spirit of revenge, or the refusal to escape the cross. Our Lord's meekness was positive. Jesus says the meek shall inherit the earth, and to inherit the earth is neither negative nor passive. The words "to inherit the earth," says Votaw, "denote all those good things which were to come with the Messianic Kingdom."[1] Now, both in Hebrew and Jewish Literature the Messianic Kingdom and all the blessings which flowed from it were to be effected by the Grace of God. But what are the 'good things' of the kingdom as revealed by and in Jesus? Or, in what sense did Jesus inherit the earth? Surely His faith in God, His Grace, His prayer-experience, obedience and sacrifice, His fidelity to His Messianic consciousness and purpose, were intrinsically the 'good things' of the kingdom. He said that His Father had committed all authority unto His hand, and He was convinced that one day He would achieve permanent and ultimate triumph for these 'good things.' In the future He would see the travail of His soul and be satisfied. In our Lord's meekness we learn what the reign of Grace would be, did it reign completely; for in His Personality and activity the kingly rule of the Father was manifest. Likewise, man's gentleness, forgiving spirit, self-mastery and obedience to the ideal of the Master show how far the motive of God controls him, how far he is working out the dynamic of God's Grace, and how deeply *makarios* he is. In the condition of blessedness God inspires the will to be meek, and through the reciprocity of the Divine and human wills man becomes convinced of his present and final inheritance of the 'good things' of the kingdom.

To hunger and thirst after righteousness is to aspire to the ideal of the kingdom as revealed by Jesus in the Sermon. This aspiration is a subjective aspect of the Grace of God. Thought, emotion and will are urged towards the object, which is the realization of the righteousness revealed in the Sermon. Because aspiration is a subjective aspect of divine Grace our Lord ascribes to it intrinsic and

[1] *Ibid.*, 19.

unique ethical qualities. To Gautama, all hunger and thirst were 'maya' or illusion, and therefore evil. To Jesus they have absolute ethical value. The soul that is conscious of the attraction of righteousness as set forth by Jesus is twice blessed. In the first place, hunger and thirst are due to the objective control of the Spiritual Being who is righteous. In the second place, 'to be filled' is but another way of saying that the Grace of God satisfies the hungry soul, even in the moments of its intensest spiritual aspiration.

The fifth Beatitude is related to our Lord's teaching on forgiveness and must be placed alongside the passages already dealt with. Blessedness is at the heart of that man who is inspired to be merciful, a condition which in turn always reacts on the human heart—we can understand the Master's eulogy of the man who forgave as he was forgiven, when we recall the importance of this ethical demand in His teaching. This Beatitude shews that the Grace of God is meant to be the prototype of the Grace of man to man. The blessedness of shewing Grace to others is rooted in the blessedness of receiving the same from the Father.

To be pure in heart, according to the teaching of Jesus, denotes purity in the inward parts—the self as thinking, feeling, willing. The nature of this purity is as inward as the experience described in Mark 7. This purity, however, is the manifesting of Holy Grace. Such language on the lips of Jesus shews how far He had already proceeded in His teaching, for He would never speak of such a condition as purity of heart unless He had first explained how it came about. The deeply spiritual experience of the Psalter must not lead us to give 'pure in heart' there the same connotation that it had on the lips of Jesus. Purity of heart to the Psalmist did not essentially involve a pure and universal ethic. Even in Psalm 139., with its remarkable spiritual penetration, where God is asked to search the heart and know the thoughts, the poet hates the wicked with perfect hatred. Our Lord never used the words 'pure in heart' of a relation which only included God and the individual heart in question.

Meekness, hunger and thirst, and Grace to all men, are the essential characteristics of the pure heart, and such purity is essentially due to Grace. It is an experience in which man is conscious of being made a partaker of the Divine Holiness.

Now the beatific vision (seeing God) is the psychological effect of this work of Grace in the human personality. Such vision carries us far beyond the hopes and actualities of Jewish Theology ; in which the doctrine of the Holiness of God permitted no such vision to man. But the Grace of God in Jesus, inspired purity of thought, emotion and motive, and gave to such purity the eyes which alone behold the beauty of Divine Holiness.

The seventh Beatitude states the ministry of reconciliation. How far forgiveness enters into this ministry is seen in the Person and Work of Jesus in the Synoptic gospels. An essential characteristic of the peace-maker is the Grace which forgives. It is thus that peace between man and man is possible. This work of reconciliation is the perpetual inspiration of Grace in the heart of man, a work which is blessedness indeed. The Beatitude assumes an experience in which love of peace and the will to effect it are rooted.

Several Beatitudes are often said to set forth passive virtues. In the strict sense of the word, however, they teach no such thing. For instance, in each Beatitude discussed, a condition is described in which the will is most active. To be poor in spirit, or meek, cannot be abstracted from the condition of dependence upon and humility before God. But in all dependence upon God the will has its task set. To be poor in spirit is not synonymous with passivity, it is rather a condition in which the will is tenaciously fixed and kept fixed upon God, and this involves a rare spiritual alertness. The refusal to retaliate or cherish thoughts of revenge, to suffer without protest or without physical resistance, as in the case of Christ, is not the full content of meekness, and the above virtues can in no wise be exhaustively

described as passive. In all such experience the will is fearfully energetic. Its grip of the thoughts and emotions is only maintained by a stupendous expenditure of moral effort. The truth is, our Lord's ethical values are intrinsic, and in all such virtues as enumerated above the will's activity is inspired. We conclude, then, that the Beatitudes represent experience which is initiated and sustained by Jesus. And we reach the Beatific Ideal only as the Grace of God in Christ controls our subjective activity.

In the verses which describe persecution it is imperative to understand the motive which prompts the disciples. To be persecuted for Jesus' sake presupposes an experience which is blessed and which Jesus Himself initiated. To suffer for the sake of Jesus must mean that Jesus is related to the suffering. That is, Jesus recognized that for no other cause than Himself would the disciples be placing their life in peril. These verses bear remarkable testimony to our Lord's consciousness of power to constrain men even in the days of His ministry. As they pursue His righteousness for His sake they will encounter antagonism and suffering, nevertheless, the kingdom is theirs, in other words, their experience is inspired by Him. The use of *heneken emou* " denotes the cause or motive which is given for an action."[1] The disciples were conscious of remarkable powers of endurance when they suffered for Christ's sake.

There is no need to assume that these verses were spoken later than the rest of the Beatitudes. In any case they fit the occasion when Jesus was sending forth the Twelve; for nothing is clearer than that He warned them to expect suffering in His cause. Their meagre material equipment was another way of urging dependence upon God as their ruling thought. The uppermost thing in their consciousness as He sent them forth was the power that He gave them. Hence, they went out to give freely as they had received freely. The Grace of Jesus, as men were conscious of it under the historic conditions of the ministry, became the mightiest

[1] Blass, *Grammar of N. T Greek*, 127.

inspiration of their life. It urged them to attempt, to accomplish, and to suffer rather than be unfaithful, for the sake of Christ.

B. Discipleship as Salt and Light

Matt. 5. 13–16; *Luke* 14. 34.

In Christian experience, the individual can never be abstracted from society, and especially from the Christian society. By virtue of that which the disciples received Jesus compared them to the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Such experience as was theirs, however, could only be conserved and developed by further obedience to the divine promptings within them. Salt could lose its savour, and in that case the disciple was blameworthy. Light was of value as they made it effective—as they made it shine for the sake of others. What is this but another way of saying that their power to cleanse society and keep it from corruption, and their power of moral illumination, were due to their relation to Christ, and their obedience to His Will? The Fourth gospel gives a remarkable interpretation of the objective and subjective aspects of Grace as light. "In Him was life and the life was the light of men";[1] or in the words of Jesus, "I am the light of the world, he that followeth Me . . . shall have the light of life."[2] The light of the disciples was derived, and it was their task to make it shine through their own subjective experience.

C. The Ethic which Exceeds

The rest of the Sermon, as far as the First evangelist is concerned, turns on 5. 20. It proceeds to unfold in ideal, and in the nature of motive, the measure in which the Ethics of the Kingdom exceeds the Ethics of Legalism. There are no

[1] 1. 4. [2] 8. 12.

critical reasons for doubting the extraordinary demand which our Lord made upon His followers in verse 20. He there states the nature of the challenge which the kingdom makes: it is a challenge which 'exceeds' all others. The righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees is stated in the Sermon, and later in Matthew 23. Our Lord said that its demands were too terrible to be borne: they were heavy burdens laid upon men's shoulders. Further, Jesus shews the intolerable weight of such righteousness to be due to its estimate of action on the external side. And he contrasted this judgment of action by results, and the Jewish Doctrine of Merit, with His own intrinsic values of character and motive. To judge single action by results inevitably leads to the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees. It ends in Legalistic Ethics. Our Lord shews this in relation to almsgiving, prayer, fasting, oaths, murder, and adultery. Passing behind the results of action, He Himself attaches absolute ethical value to motive. Hence ethical qualities belong to the self as thinking, feeling, and willing, before any external result appears. The moral quality of the action has been decided before the action is done, yea, should it never mature, intrinsic moral qualities have been secretly distilled into the personality. The self as lusting, as cherishing revenge, as secretly unforgiving, in other words, the self as motive, cannot escape the judgment of Christ. The self cannot be openly what it is not secretly. It may seem to be what it is not, as in the case of almsgiving, prayer, and fasting on the part of hypocrites, but that is self-deception, or deception of others, and deception of any kind arises from the motives which the Father sees and judges and rewards in secret.

Now in this inner world of the self, which Jesus has fathomed beyond any other, our Lord conceived His Grace to have the utmost consequences for His Ethic. His Grace, as personal, operated upon and in the self as motive, until His disciples followed His righteousness for His own sake. His power over them was most pronounced in that realm where He

alone had shewn most searchingly that moral quality attaches to action. The objective control of the Grace of Jesus was continually operating upon the self as thinking, feeling and willing, and it was by reason of the moral quality of the motive which He inspired that His followers exceeded the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees.

It is a mistake to think that Jesus called upon His followers to exceed the righteousness of the Legalists only in the sense that the universal exceeds the particular. Jesus cut at the root of all legal sanctions for righteousness by placing the Ethics of the kingdom on a Personal basis. He taught that experience within the kingdom was a spiritual communion of persons, which was rooted in the communion of each with God, for redemptive and reconciliatory ends.

D. The Absolute Principle of Love

Knowing that He brought the Grace of the Father to men, and knowing His own significance for human motive, Jesus lays down His absolute principle of love. The principle on which God acts toward men must be the principle on which His own followers also act. The Grace which they receive must be worked out into sacramental love and sacrificial service. As the Grace of God in Christ knows no barriers which are local or national, so must the love and service of the disciples be all-inclusive. The love of God to man, and man's love to his neighbour, were the objective and subjective aspects of the same experience. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself."[1] The old measure of quid pro quo among men was no longer valid: "If ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?"[2] "And if ye

[1] Luke 10. 27; Matt. 22. 37 ff. [2] Matt. 5. 46.

lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye ? "[1] There is but one unchanging principle for the disciple to act upon, and it is the same principle on which God acts toward him : " Give and it shall be given unto you, good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over. For with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."[2]

The Grace of God is kind toward the unthankful and evil, and God's son must be Godlike.[3] It is impossible to abstract the principle on which God acts towards men, and the principle on which Christ acted, from the principle on which the disciple must act. And this is only possible as the personal Grace of Jesus inspires the will of the disciple.

The most explicit statement of this ethical truth is contained in the Golden Principle of action : " All things, therefore, whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them." Now it is through what we have called the subjective aspect of Grace, or through Christ's unique control of the subjective activity of His followers, that He alone states this principle in a positive form. Apart from the consciousness that He brought divine Grace to undeserving men as dynamic ; apart from the constraint of His own Personality upon His followers ; apart from His own experience which fulfilled the principle in a positive way, Jesus knew that such a demand as He made on the human will was impossible of fulfilment. No static, but only a dynamic conception of Grace can explain and fulfil this principle. Our Lord was not simply stating an ideal, He was also revealing the positive way in which the motive of man, begotten and inspired of the Grace of God, can work out this divine principle of action.

The parable of the Good Samaritan was a case in point. Not only does the parable shew how the righteousness of the Samaritan exceeded that of the priest and Levite in *scope ;*

[1] Luke 6. 34. [2] Luke 6. 38.
[3] cf. Bruce, Matt. 5. 43 ; *Ex. G. T.*

it shews also how the Grace of the Samaritan was manifested on the principle that God Himself shewed Grace to men. As the writer of the Johannine Epistle said later, it was impossible for a man to love God and hate his brother. The Samaritan took the initiative in doing good to another who had no claim upon him whatever, except his great need and helplessness.

The mere positive statement of the Golden Principle of action would place Jesus far ahead of the Sages who gave it negative utterance. The most noteworthy instance of the negative statement of this ethical ideal is that of Confucius : "What you do not want done to yourself do not to others." But to pit this saying against that of Jesus, as is frequently done by those who regard Jesus as no more than one of the world's Sages, should not be done without due care. No one has any desire to belittle the words of Confucius ; but neither has anyone the right to belittle the words of Jesus. The saying in each case must be interpreted, not as it stands alone, but through the universe of religious and ethical ideals in which it is set. When this is done, and not before, can the true value of each be assessed.

To begin with, Confucius himself declared that He was a transmitter and not a maker. He taught no truth of a Personal God, yea, his Doctrine of God fell short of that of the ancient Chinese Sages. He had no satisfactory Doctrine of Human Nature ; at the most a vague idea that man was born good, and no idea whatever of his future destiny. And these are the two great doctrines through which we must interpret the Golden Principle ot Jesus.

Further, Confucius applied his negative principle to five relations of society only, and to none but Chinese. He taught that revenge was permissible, and blood-revenge a duty. To this day the Chinese love revenge, while, as Legge says, the Chinese attitude to foreigners in the past—a most glaring failure of the principle under discussion—though not altogether due to Confucius, has been helped by his teaching. When the Sage broke his oath, and caused a lie to

be uttered to those who called to see him at his own home, he failed to act on his own principle.

Then, what is the predominant motive in Chinese Ethics? It is fear, and this comes out in its three great moral sanctions. First, nowhere else does polydemonism furnish such a basis for ethics. Fear of *Kwei* has an essentially negative effect. Secondly, ancestor worship is burdened with ancestral demerit and is fatalistic at heart. The third great ethical basis of Confucianism is the Classics, and they imprison ethics within the iron circumference of custom, and shew that the only motive to observe customary morality is fear.

When the negative principle of Confucius is set in its own universe of thought, we can measure its significance beside the teaching of Jesus. Our business is not to depreciate the Chinese Sage, but to interpret him. When the Doctrines of God and Man, and their relation, as taught by Jesus, and exemplified in His own life, are contrasted with the teaching of Confucius, we discern the scope and character of our Lord's Golden Principle to be unique. When Jesus insists that His followers must take the initiative in doing good to others, that is unique in the History of Ethics. The main difference between Jesus and the Sages is that with the former everything turns on motive which is generated through man's personal relation with Himself; it is subjective activity which makes the first move towards those in need or sin, because it is inspired to do so. The Golden Principle rules first in the self as thinking, feeling and willing, and through the objective control of divine Grace in that inner world the ideal is possible of realization. "The negative confines us to the region of justice; the positive takes us into the region of generosity or Grace."[1]

The Golden Principle of action presents the ethical ideal for all who seek to do the Will of the Father, and bring about the kingly rule of His righteousness. This principle states the demand which is made upon the will of every man

[1] Bruce, *E. G. T., in loco.*

who has received the Grace of God. Having seen how Grace creates for man his greatest task, and inspires his will towards its completion, it is now possible to deal with those sayings in which our Lord states the strenuous nature of discipleship.

CHAPTER V

SUBJECTIVE EXPERIENCE OF GRACE WHICH IS LIFE

THE control of Jesus over man's inner life, where motive is created, can no longer be in dispute, even in the Synoptic gospels. This will be seen further as the ethical claims of Jesus become more exacting. There are several sayings, unparalleled in the demand they make upon the human will, still to be considered. They unfold our Lord's idea of what is involved in seeking " first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." These passages also shew the relation of the subjective aspect of Grace to the destiny of the individual. It has been shewn that the Hebrew conception of Retribution was a development of the doctrine of Jahweh's gracious motive in history, and that, later, the Jewish Church encouraged each of its members with the certain hope of partaking in the triumphs of the Messianic Kingdom.[1] In strict accordance with the Jewish Doctrines of Grace and Merit the pious individual was confident of his future destiny. The gospels also shew that our Lord presented the issues of life and death, or stated the relation of Grace and Judgment, in the realization of the Divine purpose.

What security and hope for the future does Jesus offer the individual disciple in the Synoptic gospels ? The answer to this question has been partly given in the chapter on ' Grace and Eschatology.' There, Jesus promised at His Parousia, a final and objective manifestation of His Grace to His followers. That was an objective guarantee, one that He identified with His own Will. We now turn to the subjective

[1] Intro., III b.

guarantee. This involves an examination of those passages in which the challenge of Jesus taxes the human will to its last ounce of exertion. The shallow evangelicalism which sees in divine Grace some arbitrary guarantee for the future life, and leaves out its categorical imperative, has no support whatever in the Synoptic gospels. On the other hand, it is impossible to do justice to the sterner ethical teaching of Jesus by interpreting it through the metaphysical presuppositions of Greek Philosophy. Such a procedure ignores the basis of the Christian Ethic itself, and fails to comprehend or explain the experience, present or promised, which our Lord called 'life.'

In the Synoptists Jesus affirms the future destiny of the individual to be bound up with the response of the human will to Himself and His claims. The individual will not be saved by virtue of an immediate return of the Lord. He will be saved, or enter into life, through the control of his subjective activity, an experience in which the Grace of God in Jesus is objective, and in which the disciple's thought, emotion and will, respond to such reality, working it out into absolute ethical values.

A. Moral Activity and Incorruption

Matt. 6. 19, 21 ; Luke 12. 32–34

Our Lord compared the moral activity of His disciples to abiding treasure which neither moth nor rust can consume. To do the will of Jesus is to be rich toward God, for such activity is as utterly unselfish on the one hand as the will of the rich fool was utterly selfish on the other. The selfish life lays up treasure which is corruptible : "thou fool . . . whose shall those things be which thou hast provided ?"[1] The personality, however, which seeks first the kingdom of God and His righteousness is as imperishable as the kingdom itself. That is, life consists in being and doing, not in having, and

[1] Luke 12. 13–20.

such life knows no corruption. To Paul the incorruptible life was due to Christ. (Cf. " I have put on incorruption through His name ; and have put off corruption by His Grace.")[1] The synoptic passages remind us of the Jewish Doctrine of Merit with its treasure laid up against the day when God strikes the balance between good and evil works. But when Jesus identified incorruptible treasure with inspired motive, or with the inward life which worked out freely that which it had freely received, He shewed that the future of the individual could never be abstracted from the moral values attaching to his own personality.

B. The Narrow Gate and Way

The two ' Gates ' and the two ' Ways ' referred to in Matthew 7. 13 f. contrast the ethical conditions which lead to life and destruction respectively. It is as impossible to travel both ways as it is to serve two masters. Luke alone mentions the wrestle that is necessary to enter the door of the kingdom,[2] while the First evangelist states where the way—where life within the kingdom—leads. Luke's statement is enough to shew that the entrance into the kingdom is not as simple as is often supposed. But his logion would not seem to be parallel with Matthew's ; for the latter points out that human personality must be surrendered to the same divine and objective pressure (*tethlimmenē*) as that of Jesus Himself. As the face of our Lord was set steadfastly towards Jerusalem, so that He impressed men with His own tenacity of Will, so must the will of His followers be subject to the pressure of the same Grace. But that ' way ' is life, and life abundant. The First evangelist uses the remarkable word *zōē*, which in the Fourth gospel expresses the ' eternal life ' offered by Jesus as a gracious gift. That is, the subjective activity which leads to life according to the First gospel is stated to be a gift in the Fourth. Hence, the guarantees for

[1] Odes of Solomon, 15. 8. [2] 13. 24 f.

the future are inseparable from the subjective aspect of divine Grace in the present.

C. Permanence of Character Built on Christ

The parable which closes the Sermon describes the future of the individual who has toiled and endured until he has built himself on the words of Christ.[1] Matthew compared the two builders as wise and foolish. Luke adds, "everyone that cometh unto Me and heareth my words, and doeth them," is as one "who digged and went deep and laid a foundation,"[2] The others heard, but did not, and built without a foundation at all. Now such psychological terms suggest the same tenacity of will that we saw in relation to the Word which was sown by the Son of Man. The failure of the man who built without a foundation was a failure of the will. He heard and willed not. On the other hand, the parable affirms the permanence of the character of that man who heareth and doeth the words of Christ. It is noteworthy that the words of Jesus are the foundation or the rock on which the structure is built. But to build on Christ's words is to build on obedience to Himself. It is to build through His inspiration, and it is to build for eternity. To say that Jesus was exhorting men to build against impending catastrophe, and that His Ethic was no more than interim, is to wrench the meaning of words. If His words were not to pass away, neither could that which was built upon them.[3] There is no need to sacrifice the intrinsic and therefore eternal character of the synoptic Ethics to an arbitrary Jewish apocalyptic idea. Jesus conceived Himself and His words to be permanent, teaching that all character that was built upon Himself or His words, which were identified with Himself, stood or fell with Himself. Whatever the future brought, it could never shake that which was built upon Himself, for it was like Himself, of that nature which could never be shaken.

[1] Matt. 7. 24–27 = Luke 6. 47–49.
[2] 6. 47 f. [3] Matt. 24. 35.

The whole parable throws great responsibility on the will of the individual to build. So much so, the individual appears to be master of his own destiny. But what does he build upon, and with what does he build? When such a question is asked we are brought back to that reciprocal spiritual activity between the Grace of Jesus and the will of the disciple, in which the latter is inspired by the Grace of the Master, and transmutes the same into personality, such as withstands all the ravages of time, and is by reason of its own response to divine control, conscious of guarantees for the future.

D. Social Ethics and Destiny

The parable of Final Grace and Judgment[1] is concerned pre-eminently with the bearing of the Christian Ethic on the future life of the individual. Jesus uses familiar imagery as a background for His own divisive Ethical principle. "It seems to me," says Burkitt, "that we are really in the presence of a sort of Midrash, by which I mean an application of the Judgment scene in Enoch to enforce a particular moral. We do Matthew 25. 31 ff. an injustice if we treat it as a description of the Day of Judgment given to an audience who did not know beforehand what would happen there: on the contrary, it assumes that the scene of Judgment as given in Enoch is already familiar, and then goes on to tell the well-known tale again—with a difference."[2]

What is the difference? It is surely more than an enlargement of scope from the particular to the universal. As Burkitt says, in the Book of Enoch, men are judged for being Gentiles. But the teaching of this parable, as far as those on the right hand are concerned, seems near to that of the Good Samaritan. It shews that they have initiated according to the positive and Golden Principle of action, that service to the sick and poor, such as was the case with the

[1] Matt. 25. 31 ff.
[2] Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, 25.

Samaritan. They are those who have exceeded the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees. Further, the failure of those on the left hand is the failure of Legalistic Ethics. Now comes the difference. Since the former go into eternal life and the latter into eternal punishment, the destiny of the individual is clearly involved in his realization or otherwise of Christ's Golden Principle of action. The hope of the individual to share in the final objective manifestation of divine Grace—entrance into eternal life—cannot be abstracted from the social service in which he realises the Christian Ideal. Love to Jesus and love to His brethren are necessary aspects in the unity of Christian experience. There is no such thing as fellowship with Jesus, forgiveness of sins, an experience of divine Grace which is 'life,' apart from strenuous moral activity for Christ's sake amongst His brethren. Where Grace abounds its moral results are seen through the individual upon society. A dualism between the disciple's character and service is impossible. This parable shews that subjective activity such as we have seen to be inspired by the Grace of God in Jesus, must lead to life. The absence of such experience can only lead to death—a scathing verdict on the Ethics of Legalism.

This parable, therefore, is not to be interpreted only through its eschatological framework and drapery. Its emphasis is on the inward positive character of the Christian Ethic, which reconciles into one unity the end of the individual and society. It exalts the nature of that motive which carries in its own bosom the assurance of final hope and triumph.

E. The Ethic of Vigilance

Ethical and eschatological ideas are closely related in our Lord's repeated exhortation to be ready for His return. The strenuous nature of the demand upon the will of the disciples is undoubtedly accentuated by its eschatological setting ; still, the motive for readiness is by no means entirely due to any apocalyptic theory. *Fidelity to Christ* is the

central fact of these exhortations, and such fidelity is inspired by Christ. Moreover, some of these passages, from the ethical standpoint, assume a very considerable period before the Parousia. But whenever the "Return' shall be, Christ demands that daily response to His Will which constitutes a condition of readiness. The Wedding Garment symbolizes this condition of readiness,[1] as does the preparation of oil for the coming of the Bridegroom.[2] "This readiness is the righteousness obtained by obedience to Christ's teaching (5. 20); or by doing the Will of God (7. 21); or the moral qualifications which Christ recommends (18. 3); or confession of Him before men."[3] Luke gives moral intensity to these ethico-eschatological sayings: "Let your loins be girded about and your lamps burning."[4] They are to be so ready that they may open the door *straightway* when the Lord knocketh. He also adds the logion on fidelity to what has been given, and sharpens its ethical import.[5] We have already pointed out the relation of this readiness to prayer-experience, and that fidelity, upon which everything turns, is inspired by the objective control of the Grace which is given. Now we see that such subjective activity assures the individual of security both for the present and the future.

F. Death and Life

The permanence of the individual life as bound up with the ethical demands of Jesus is seen, further, in the direct teaching on death and life in the Synoptic gospels. The passages which speak of the subjective activity which leads unto life, and is rewarded with entrance into life, suggest at first sight that life is something given when the kingdom is consummated. Such passages, however, cannot be abstracted from others which assume the kingdom to be in existence during the ministry of Jesus. It is through the subjective activity which Jesus inspires and finally blesses that the

[1] Matt. 22. 11 ff. [2] 25. 4. [3] Allen, *Comm. Matt.*, 236.
[4] 12. 35 ff. [5] 12. 47.

reconciliation between the two views of the kingdom must be effected. " The ' life ' which is projected into the future, and described figuratively as a gift bestowed from without, is in the last resort the life of moral activity."[1] This saying does not carefully preserve the objective aspect of such activity in the Synoptics. We cannot resolve the eschatological element entirely into the ethical. The moral activity in question is due to the objective control of the Grace of Jesus, and such Grace is Personal. Whether it be objective in Jesus during His ministry or at His Parousia, we need His Personality to account for the moral activity in question, as set forth in the first three gospels.

Apart from the Old Testament use of the terms ' life ' and ' death ' in a religious sense, Jesus gives ' death ' an ethical significance : " Let the dead bury their dead,"[2] means that they who were not already His disciples were spiritually dead : " This my son was dead and is alive again " can only mean death in an ethical sense. These passages imply also that men passed from death to life as they accepted the Grace of God and surrendered their wills to its demands. This is most pronounced in the case of the lost son. Jesus, therefore, in the Synoptic gospels associates life in its deepest spiritual sense with the experience of divine forgiveness and the will to follow Him. " As ' life,' to the mind of Jesus, consists in moral obedience and communion with God, so in the opposite condition He perceives the true death."[3]

It is enough to point out at this juncture that ' life ' is no arbitrary divine gift. It is morally conditioned. It is a gift as in the case of the Prodigal Son, but it is a gift which makes the supreme challenge to the will. So much so, unless the will responds to the inspiration of Christ's Grace, and persists in a subjective experience which is described as " following Christ," there is no life, but a state of death. When the moral demands of all true evangelical experience are thus set forth—when Christian Ethics is

[1] E. F. Scott, *Fourth Gospel*, 239.
[2] Matt. 8. 22. [3] E. F. Scott, *D. C. G.*, I, 428.

seen to rest on this evangelical basis—the apocalyptic view of ' life ' as a gift when the kingdom is consummated is seen to be continuous with, and the crown of, present experience. If the eschatological idea of life does not resolve itself " at its centre into the *purely* ethical and religious," as Scott says it does, it is, nevertheless, through his inspired ethical experience that the Christian is assured of those guarantees for time and eternity, which Schweitzer in effect makes to depend on purely arbitrary action.

When we relate our Lord's Parousia teaching with the subjective guarantees of eternal life that we have considered, we see how deeply rooted both are in ethical conditions. In the teleological drama of history we have first the Father's will to save men ; then we have the will of Jesus as Son of Man, making incarnate in Himself His Father's redemptive motive ; then we have the will of man to which Jesus makes His ultimate appeal. Through the interaction of these Wills, in which the human personality is conscious of the mightiest inspirational energies, we must seek the reconciliation of the apocalyptic and ethical teaching of the Master in the Synoptic gospels.

CHAPTER VI

GRACE AND THE CHRISTIAN ETHIC

A. Grace and Dying to Live

1. *Life Through Death*

THE sternest demands of Jesus upon the will of His followers are expressed in several passages which insist on unconditional self-renunciation. The synoptic tradition places these exacting claims immediately following the announcement of the Passion at Cæsarea Philippi: "If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross, and follow Me. For whosoever shall save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life *for my sake* and the gospel's shall save it."[1] When Jesus spoke of man losing his life in attempting to save it, He was using words which covered the same experience that is meant by His ethical use of the term 'death.' To find true life involved that moral activity which was fulfilment of the will of Jesus. Considering the unique claim that is made in these words we expect to find some unique relation between Jesus and His disciples. We believe this is found in the words *heneken emou*, denoting the motive of the disciple's renunciation. The self as thinking, feeling, and especially as willing, was controlled objectively by the gracious Personality of the Master, so that He was the inspiration of all heroism in His followers. "The nearest approach to any reference to love of Himself as a motive for conduct is to be found in those passages in which He puts His own Person in the foreground, requiring of His disciples a readiness to sacrifice themselves for His sake."[2] On these occasions, when He urges upon them

[1] Mc. 8. 34 f. [2] *D. C. G.*, II, 80.

sacrifice without reluctance, He identifies Himself with His own Ethical Ideal. Hence the passages which insist on a decisive confession of Himself before men ;[1] also that His followers should leave houses and kinsfolk and lands for His sake ;[2] that unless He was the supreme object of their love the disciple was not worthy of Him ;[3] that His followers must be prepared to be hated of all men for His name's sake.[4] These momentous words reveal in one way, more than other synoptic evidence, that the Grace of God, objective in Jesus, was indispensable for the attainment of the Christian Ethic. Such renunciation would tax their thought, emotion, and will to the utmost limits, but He was confident that they could endure for His sake. If discipleship involved men in a life-long surrender which gave self no quarter, and strained endurance to such a point, the resources of Christ operating in the disciples were equal to the demand. He could inspire their surrender until it carried them far beyond their dreams, even through death to life. There is everything in the experience here that we find in that of Paul when he said, " I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me."

2. *Drinking the Lord's Cup*

Mark 10. 32–45

The nature of the self-renunciation unto death is explained to the disciples after the request from James and John for positions of eminence in the kingdom. In the discussion of this passage in Book I it was shewn that our Lord's words were significant for Christian Ethics. Positions of eminence, reasoned Jesus, were given to those whose activity was one of service ; and the service was to partake of the nature of Christ's, when He gave His life a ransom for many. As Christ's service was the subjective effect of divine Grace, so, we conclude, the disciples' service would be also. This service is

[1] Matt. 10. 32, 33=Luke 12. 8, 9. [2] Matt. 10. 29.
[3] Matt. 10. 38. [4] Mc. 13. 9, 13.

explained in terms which push the principle of self-surrender to its furthest possible limits. To drink the cup of Christ and to be baptized with His baptism, can only mean that they were called upon to share the indivisible aim and motive which ruled His own sacrifice. Just as His service had involved Him in a fearful struggle of Will ; so would theirs. But resources of the same nature of which Christ was conscious, in fulfilling the purpose of the Father, were also able to urge them to that ministry which was a giving of their life. We have refrained from using the word 'love,' for the Synoptic gospels themselves rarely use it.[1] It is impossible, however, to escape the conviction that we are discussing experience in which love is the almighty motive. Now love is not mere emotion. In love, the self is conscious of an object ; it is conscious of a passion for its object ; it is conscious also of a constraint which is controlled by its object. As the Fourth gospel says, when Jesus came to give His life a ransom for many, His motive was love. He was conscious, and He describes experience which confirms our reasoning, that the same love passed through Himself into the motive of His followers, inspiring them to their ministry of self-renunciation.

3. *Inspiration to Finish Life's Task*

Luke 14. 25–35

Luke describes the deliberate self-surrender required by Christ in two parables which shew the possibility of subjective resources giving out before the task of discipleship is completed. Jesus expects a man to sit down and count the cost, that when he begins to build he may be able to finish. The logion on the condition of discipleship in verses 26–27, and the manner in which Luke returns to the same condition in verse 33, lead us to conclude that the two parables must have been uttered to shew the relation of moral resources to the

[1] See Matt. 10. 37, which is a clear case.

moral ideal. What was meant 'by counting the cost,' or 'taking counsel,' whether it was possible to finish with what was already to hand? Luke leaves no doubt that, in counting the cost of discipleship, a man can only hope to finish well by renouncing all that he hath (v. 26–27) for the sake of Christ. He must be inspired by the Master. It is reasonable to assume, we know it from the gospels, that multitudes whom Jesus addressed were attracted by His Ideal but were not counting the cost of attaining it. They thought they could finish without the surrender that Christ demanded. Now Jesus makes it clear that His supremacy over all other claims, which implies nothing short of unconditional surrender for His sake, was necessary to achieve His Ideal. But this also means that when their subjective activity was directed towards Christ, they were capable of realizing all that the Grace of God made it possible for them to be. The measure of their renunciation for the sake of Christ *was* surrender to those resources which could carry them on to His Ideal. Concerning such surrendered life, it should not be said, "this man began to build, but was not able to finish." This is illustrated by verses 34–35. What savour is to salt so is complete renunciation for the sake of Christ to effective discipleship. Again, we see, through relation with Jesus, subjective activity is inspired to achieve His Ideal. The subjective aspect of divine Grace in the synoptists cannot be abstracted from the Christian Ethic.

In these passages which demand the most generous expenditure of moral effort, life is never regarded as something which a man wins: "when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do."[1] The Grace of Jesus casts out all merit.

[1] Luke 17. 10.

B. Grace and the New Legalism

It is imperative that the Person of Jesus as inspiring the self-renunciation demanded by Him in the Synoptic gospels should receive the fullest acknowledgment. Some critics sacrifice Jesus and His Ethic to the synoptic teaching on the Parousia. They make Him the child of the Jewish apocalyptic hope. The Modernists deny that the moral activity which has been discussed in these pages has any evangelical basis such as we have claimed. They deny that Jesus demanded, or received, any such significance for His Ethic during the historic ministry. They hold Paul responsible for all attempts to find the inspiration of the Christian motive in some such experience as conversion. As for Jesus, "His deeds and His words, so far from being final, were germinal." It is then claimed that the ethical teaching in the Synoptic gospels must be explained through the perfected ethical principle of the Fourth gospel. This is usually called the principle of 'dying to live.' It is expressed in our Lord's words to certain Greeks: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit. He that loveth his life loseth it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."[1] These words are said to condense into themselves the whole content of the Christian Ethic; to state the Ideal which overcomes the dualism of all other ethical systems, and reconciles into one splendid unity the aims of the individual and society. This principle also seems to offer a way of escape from the apocalyptic problems of the Parousia. Most of all does it lend itself to the Evolutionary Method of Ethics. Then, it is said to be the one principle which furnishes an admirable explanation of the life and death of Jesus in the Synoptic gospels.

[1] John 12. 24, 25. There is nothing in these verses which carries us further than the passages dealt with in Section A of the present chapter.

But it is surely a mistake to suppose that the principle of ' dying to live ' in the Fourth gospel, is the final development of the germ of our Lord's teaching during the ministry. It certainly does not present, as some claim, the results of a process by which this truth shook itself free, at last, from those prophecies of a " new supernatural age," with which it was at first inseparably intertwined by the Synoptists. We have sought to shew that the eschatology of the Synoptic gospels cannot be resolved entirely into ethical principles, any more than the objective can be resolved entirely into the subjective. Our Lord's statement of the principle of ' dying to live ' in Mark 8. 34–37, does not receive any necessary eschatological turn from verse 38. The sternest demands in the Synoptic gospels, or the principle of ' dying to live,' are rooted in a Personal contact with Jesus and not in any views of a " ' new supernatural age.' " We admit that the ethic of vigilance is strongly coloured by the apocalyptic hope, but that is due to the fact that Jesus Himself is central to that hope. There is a considerable amount of ethical teaching in the Synoptic gospels the value of which is quite independent of any such event as the early Parousia. Nor does this principle in the Synoptists explain the death of Jesus Christ in any other way than Christ Himself explained it. That is, there was an ultimate divine motive in the life and death of Jesus.

Again, it soon becomes obvious that the Fourth gospel itself is not free from the cataclysmic view of the Parousia : " the hour is coming, when all that are in the tombs shall hear His voice, and shall come forth : they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done ill unto the resurrection of condemnation." [1] These words hark back to the view of a ' new supernatural age,' inaugurated by the return of our Lord. Thus, while the writer of the Fourth gospel spiritualizes the primitive apocalyptic elements of the Synoptic gospels, he does not altogether shed their influence. Edward Caird assumes that the Fourth gospel has

[1] 5. 28 f.

altogether outrun the apocalyptic idea of progress, the idea that God intervenes in human life and history. How far this is from being the case is most pronounced in the doctrine of the ' new birth ' from above. The Fourth gospel presents such an antagonism, not ultimate, between flesh and spirit, that only an act of the Spirit of God can effect the change of the ' new birth ' in human nature. The place given to ' knowledge ' in relation to eternal life, while showing signs of Greek influence, is soundly ethical, never metaphysical, and shews that such ' knowledge ' is of the objective reality of divine Grace. The new birth is an experience which man himself is impotent to accomplish. It is a direct act of God due to His Grace in His only begotten Son. This is the answer of the Fourth gospel itself to those who see in it the evolution of the Greek view of redemption by knowledge.

The ' become-what-you-are ' theory, and the ' die-to-live ' theory, as expounded by Caird, rest on the Greek, not on the Christian, view of Being. They have only a show of support in the Fourth gospel, which of all the New Testament documents is most imperative in its affirmation of the new birth as due to the Grace of God in Jesus. The spiritualizing of the Parousia hope has led the writer to discard much that was purely Jewish concerning the method of realizing the kingdom ; on the other hand, it has resulted in a remarkable application of the apocalyptic idea of progress to individual change. The Fourth gospel insists on the transcendent character of divine action in the conversion of the individual equally with Paul.

The method of explaining the germ of New Testament Christianity by its perfected results may be stated in totally misleading terms. It has not infrequently made the most tremendous assumptions. It is true that the acorn can only be adequately explained through the full-grown oak, or the child through all that he afterwards becomes and does. But what do we mean by such explanation ? The development of the acorn is a purely physical process, clearly an insufficient guide to the development of personality. Further,

Jesus said that the child belonged to the kingdom of Heaven. Is that fact always revealed in his progress to, and attainment of, manhood? Reasoning back through the man to the child, should we always be sure of the truth of our Lord's words? The same difficulties arise when men speak of understanding the 'germ' of the Christian religion through its latest manifestations. "If we wish to understand what Christianity is, we must ask what it is now, after the lapse of nineteen centuries, and only then can we tell what was wrapped up in its first form."[1] In one sense this is true. But again and again we see that there is such a thing as evolution in religion which is not progress. It may be that the present condition of Christianity comes under that judgment. What is to happen in that case? How does such a theory account for Judaism in relation to the eighth-century prophets and the Psalmists, or fetishism in relation to totemism? In order to understand totemism with its genuine religious experience, is it necessary to wait until some such spurious growth as fetishism has occurred? There is development in New Testament doctrine, but such development may, or may not, be able to endure the judgment of the ethical values which cannot be abstracted from the historic ministry of Jesus. The ethical life of the New Testament is richest in the Synoptic gospels. So is its experience of divine Grace. In the ministry of our Lord the New Testament experience of 'life' has its rise. Not on the way to Damascus, not at Ephesus, do we see the beginnings of the inspiration of Christian motive. It is only as Paul's doctrine has been true to this ethical experience as sketched in the Synoptic gospels that he has had a permanent influence on the development of Christianity. As Headlam points out, there were elements in Paul's teaching which must be traced to his Rabbinical training. He dealt with problems as they arose, and sometimes his Rabbinic dialectic has to be taken into consideration. "To this side belongs, probably, all the more formal

[1] Watson, *Philosophical Basis of Religion*, 187.

side of his teaching on justification, his theory of Christ as the Second Adam, the description of the origin of sin and death to the fall of Adam, his language on predestination and election, some elements in his conception of the philosophy of history, and, to some extent at any rate, his Biblical exegesis. All these are the most definitely Pauline elements. They are entirely, or almost entirely, absent from other writings of the New Testament, except in so far as Acts refers to them ; they were not shared by any of his contemporaries ; and they did not become part of traditional Christianity. . . . The other side of St. Paul's contribution to Christianity was of a different character. It was due to the reality of his Christianity . . . that he seemed to know even better than many of those who had been with Jesus the mind of his Master. . . . Faith, discipleship, love, all expressing his devotion to Christ as his Redeemer, were the key to all that he taught."[1] These truths culminated in the teaching of the Epistle to the Ephesians, with its sublime doctrine of divine Grace, and its august conception of the Christian Church. It is as Paul develops the principles which control discipleship in the Synoptic gospels that he has a permanent influence on Christianity.

Edward Caird is, as he has been claimed, one of two most influential forerunners of Continental Modernism.[2] It is beyond dispute that his attractive and lucid treatment of the Religion of Jesus, 'nobly untrue' as that treatment is, has won, or influenced, many disciples. Starting from Caird's assumptions, criticism has furnished an interpretation of the Synoptic gospels which entirely eliminates the supernatural, and denies to Jesus any significance beyond that of one who revealed the Unity of Divine Being as it was manifested in nature and in man.

Now Modernism claims that the principle of 'dying to live,' more than any other, explains Jesus, and that it enunciates His significance as a religious Teacher. It is there-

[1] Headlam, *St. Paul and Christianity*, 203 f.
[2] P. Sabatier, *Modernism*, 93. (Newman is said to be the other.)

fore said to be an ethical truth for all time. Jesus was the first to discover man's true relation to God and to carry through without flinching all that such relation involved. In accordance with his philosophical method, Caird explains the opposition which was necessary to enable Jesus to realize Himself in dying to live.[1] This opposition was as necessary to Him as He was to it. Thus Caird extracts the sting of evil by making it necessary to the development of the good. This view of evil is Pantheistic, and cannot be accepted as explaining the New Testament word *hamartia.* Consequently, in the life and death of Jesus, Caird sees no transcendent purpose in relation to sin. Neither Christ's life nor death had any significance beyond that of teaching and exemplifying the new ethical principle of 'dying to live.' In that act Christ realized Himself. In no sense did His life and death concern the redemption of the race. He was not the source of gracious inspiration, because He was not Redeemer.

This view of Jesus has led to what we call Modern Ethical Legalism, which accepts the Christian standard of life but cuts the nerve of its inspiration. It admits the value of our Lord's ethical teaching, but dispenses with Him as the *sine qua non* of its achievement in others.

If the Church has been mistaken in attributing Christian character and service to the regenerating Grace of God in Jesus, on what basis does the Christian Ethic rest ? It rests, says Caird, in the spiritual nature of man's relation to God. Having destroyed the false particularism of the Jewish Doctrines of God and Man, Jesus affirmed a new spiritual relation between the human and the divine. It was no longer possible to deny any man his natural-spiritual birthright. God was Spirit, so was man, and this furnished an indestructible link between them. The Universal revealed itself in and through the particular. It was, therefore, as impossible to abstract God from man, as man from God.

[1] For references in this chapter see E. Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, Lectures V.–X.

Now, Jesus does teach that every individual is inseparable from the Universal. It is a big assumption, however, to reason that He did so as a metaphysician. He pointed out that every human soul had intrinsic and absolute worth in the sight of His Father—a truth which carried Jesus at once into problems of the religious and ethical life. Caird, however, thinks that Jews and non-Jews had failed to discover this fundamental principle of the spiritual existence of man, and had therefore been unable to set it forth in relation to the principle of 'dying to live.' Jesus taught and did what had been missed through human ignorance or incapacity. In other words, Jesus was the first to realize and to set forth the principle of 'become-what-you-are'; to call men to realize their natural-spiritual relationship with God, of which the human race in the past had been ignorant. And just as Jesus had realized in His own life and death the principle of 'become-what-you-are,' so the self-realization of every other individual must be attained by working out the same principle.

Caird sharpens his theory further by explaining away Paul's conversion. He insists that Jesus purged religion from its catastrophic elements, and that Paul is responsible for their re-introduction into Christianity. That is, Jesus taught and exhibited the evolution of the spiritual principle, liberating ethics from the trammels of apocalyptic, and Paul re-introduced the latter, thus confusing the spiritual and the supernatural. Now Paul's conversion bears witness to the objective character of divine Grace, to a supernatural occurrence, to an act from above. Caird, however, cannot admit any such thing. It would be admitting miracle. And Paul's testimony to miracle as the turning-point in his own life he regards as secondary and treacherous evidence. Nor does he think, that for us, the law of life through death need rest on any such miraculous basis.[1]

The issue then is this—did Paul carry over the Jewish particularistic conception of Grace (the apocalyptic notion

[1] See *Evolution of Religion*, 240, 241.

of divine intervention) and universalize it through the death of Jesus ? Having torn the cross from its Jewish setting, and having made it the central revelation of divine Grace for all men, was Paul the first to transform the transcendent eschatological idea into an immanent ethical one ?[1] Pfleiderer maintains that he did so. So does Caird. Paul is said to be the author of an " entirely new ethical system."[2] His " new ethical principle is no less a landmark in the history of morality than justification by faith is in the history of religion."[3] This means that forgiveness by or through Jesus was not taught before His death ; that forgiveness and personal contact with Jesus must not be regarded as having any significance for motive during the ministry. According to Caird, this view of forgiveness as the dynamic of Christian character and service was due to Paul's confusion of the spiritual and the supernatural. Jesus had taught men to become what they were, to realize their own germ by growing into the likeness of God. According to Paul they were to become what they were not. Pfleiderer is most explicit concerning the experience of Paul himself : " it *seemed* as though he had become a new creature."[4] What would the apostle say to this ?

This, then, is the Modern Legalism which accepts the Christian Ethic of ' dying to live ' without a proper making manifest of the Christian motive or inspiration to obedience. Such an interpretation of the life and death of Jesus as manifesting the final synthesis which reconciles all conflicting elements in human experience, and robs Jesus of any significance for Christian motive, must be judged by the New Testament itself and by history as a whole. The evidence of the Synoptic gospels on such an issue is, we believe, decisive. Forgiveness was as real an experience before the death of Jesus as it has been since. And forgiveness is miracle. Even in the Synoptic gospels we have seen love evoked by

[1] Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, Vol. I, 19.
[2] *Ibid.*, 22. [3] p. 22.
[4] *Christian Origins*, 167, the writer's italics.

forgiveness. With regard to the question, " whether the Gospels inspired St. Paul or St. Paul created the Gospel, there is," says Headlam, " no doubt that the former alternative is correct."[1] Paul's views on the nature of inspiration toward the Christian Ideal reflect directly what we have seen to be involved in the subjective aspect of Grace in the synoptic sources. That which yields its life is potent with life itself. That which is dead or potentially dead does not, in giving up its own individuality, live again. Our Lord spoke of a ' grain of wheat ' and it is in relation to the potent life of the grain of wheat that we must understand its increase to thirty or a hundredfold. Modern science says that " life is from life," and in the Synoptic gospels our Lord never attributes the spiritual life under discussion to humanity. It is the Personality of Jesus that is creative of this life, and through forgiveness and Personal fellowship with Jesus the potency of His own life passed into the thought, emotion and will of man. Further, it is exactly on this issue that the ' become-what-you-are ' theory has failed to justify itself by results.

Caird's interpretation of the principle of ' dying to live ' is at the best the flower of Stoicism, just as Stoicism was the blossom of the Socratic bud. The impersonal logos of Stoicism, manifesting itself in nature and man, had already provided the world with a satisfactory metaphysical monism. But, to the end, the dualism of Stoic Ethics contradicted the monism on which it was supposed to rest. The Wise Man of the Stoics was to live according to reason by withdrawing from society, or abstracting thought from passion. The Stoic was not master of all he surveyed. He could only realize himself in isolation from that society which was as necessary to him as he was to it. The ethical dualism of Stoicism was therefore a contradiction of its logos doctrine.[2] Jesus, we are told, succeeded where Stoicism failed. He is said to take over the

[1] Headlam, *ibid.*, 200.

[2] Yet Pfleiderer says that Stoicism and Pauline Ethics agree on three main points: (1) Freedom from the world. (2) Conquest of sensuality. (3) Brotherly love. The fundamental principle in them both is said to be " become what you are."—*Origins*, 179.

Ethical Monotheism of the eighth-century prophets, deftly to eliminate its element of nationalism, and shew that every man has a spiritual relation with the Universal. This, He makes it His main duty to teach, calling upon men to realize to the full that which is already theirs in germ. Jesus does not inculcate world flight as a means to self-realization. On the other hand, He states the principle, 'die-to-live,' and acts upon it. This principle states the higher egoism which is said to include in itself the higher altruism. Thus does Jesus solve the antinomy between good and evil, between the individual and society, explaining all differences as manifestation of a Unity, the principle of which He realizes in and through His own conflicts. Caird says he finds this theory of Jesus in the Synoptic gospels. To judge what ground he has for this statement we turn to the synoptic teaching on divine Grace. We have seen such Grace in its objective glory. Jesus was conscious of power on the earth to forgive sins. He was conscious that He had come to seek and to save the lost. The defect of the lost was not metaphysical; it was a Personal loss, of which both Jesus and His Father were conscious. It is the fundamental fact of the Synoptic gospels that the motive and teaching of Jesus has everything to do with the moral condition of those who are lost. It was His motive to change their moral condition by forgiveness, a change which is the miracle of miracles. As we have sought to point out, this experience of forgiveness involved in its very nature an objective control of subjective activity.

Those who wrote after the Death and Resurrection of our Lord, as men lit up from the inside, interpreted Him as the Redeemer who came to abide in human hearts as the Living Christ. It was possible then to say clearly, "Without Me ye can do nothing." In the second part of this work, where Jesus is seen to offer the greatest possible challenge to the human will, He is also seen to be, during the historic ministry, as necessary to the inspiration of such a will, as was the Living Christ in post-Ascension days.

At this point I must lay my pen down, still lured by the glory of God's Grace which He freely bestowed upon us in the Beloved: in whom we have our redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of His Grace. I have done no more than take a cup and dip it into the river of Grace, which for me is clear as crystal, as it flows from the throne of God and the Lamb. In drinking of this cup I am persuaded that Christian discipleship is no 'easy' thing in a world such as this is. There is much that is false, soporific, legalistic, and terribly ineffective in modern Christianity. We need to recover for the Church the Master's Doctrine of Grace. Too many assume that they can receive His Grace without being committed to anything which is dear to His heart. Yet, unless it humiliates us, uproots our pride, urges us to turn this present selfish world-order upside down, we may well doubt whether we have received it at all. If Christian discipleship means anything it means everything. Most of all is this true for the Christian minister. My own spiritual pilgrimage has been uphill, but neither Science, nor Philosophy, nor Biblical Criticism, nor the Comparative Method of studying Religion, has been able to throw any doubt upon my experience of the Grace of Jesus Christ. The foundations of evangelical experience stand sure. Paul knew the secret of loyalty in the Christian ministry: "But I hold not my life of any account, as dear unto myself, so that I may accomplish my course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the Grace of God."

THE END

INDEX

Abrahams, 104
Adam, 35
Adeney, 199
Allen, 162, 218
Andrews, H. T., 2, 5, 135, 137, 139
Apocalyptic, Jewish, 33 f.; confusion of Jewish and Christian, 140; as determinism, 39, 142; and Messianic hope, 38; and temptation, 56; Fourth gospel, 226; Synoptic, 4, 134 ff., 226
Atonement, 22, 72–98
Augustine, 5, 189

Bacon, 170
Baptist, John the, 46, 52, 56, 126, 156
Bartlett, 172
Beatitudes, 199 ff.
Bennett, 69
Bernard, E. R., 69
Bousset, 2, 86, 120, 124, 135
Box, G. H., 20, 29 f., 43
Briggs, 46
Bruce, 160, 187, 208, 210
Burkitt, 138, 144, 216

Caird, E., 4, 50, 77 f., 147, 227 ff.
Calvin, 58, 115 f., 161
Charis, 1, 11, 13, 25, 44 f.
Charles, *passim*, 25–42, 134, 139 f., 183
Chasids, 27, 33
Circumcision, 22
Confucius, 209 f.
Covenant in Priestly Code, 21 f.; in apocalyptic, 38; New, 37, 86 ff.
Cyrus, 14 f., 105

Davidson, A. B., 22, 156
Denney, 82, 156
Determinism, 33, 39 f., 65, 142
Deutero-Isaiah, 14 f. *See* Suffering Servant
Die-to-live ethic, 77, 225 f.
Dobschütz, 138

Ephesians, Ep. to, 229
Epiphanes, Antiochus, 27, 39
Eschatology. *See* Apocalyptic and Immortality
Ethic, evolutionary, 116, 225 f.
Ethics, Christian, and future life, 213 f.; exceeds legalism, 205; and miracle, 124; and parables, 174; and Parousia, 218 f.
Evolution of Religion, 4, 134, 192 f., 230; not progress, 13, 42, 228
Ezekiel, 16, 18, 38

Fairbairn, A. M., 82
Fairweather, 137
Faith, 151 ff., 187
Forgiveness, cost of, 17 f.; *passim*, 72–98; and ethics, 7, 17, 177; by Jesus, 61 f., 147, 232 ff.; by man, 202; for unintentional sins only, 22 f.; in Tests. of Patriarchs, 30, 183
Forrest, 139
Forsyth, 79, 81, 93

Garvie, 59, 76, 85, 99 f.
Gautama, 35, 202
Golden Principle of Love, 207, 217

Grace, as *differentia*, 36, 195; as determinism, 33, 39 f., 65, 142; inspires Christian Ethics, 6 f., 13, 16 f., 19, 56, 125, 167, 178 f., 183, 198 f., 219 f., 222 ff.; as favour, 9 f., 24, 33, 42, 44; and future life, 36 f., 134 f.; as loving-kindness, 11 f.; and Parousia, 134 f.; as progress, 13, 36 f., 41, 227
Gray, G. B., 44, 88
Green, T. H., 143

Hackmann, 35
Harnack, 2, 120
Headlam, 229, 233
Hebrews, Ep. to, 70, 77
Heneken emou, 204, 221
Holy Spirit, 7, 155 f., 188
Hosea, 12
Hugel, von, 191

Immortality in O. T., 33; and apocalyptic, 38; and ethics, 213 f.; and retribution, 36
Individual, value of, 36, 104 f., 230 f.
Inge, 187

Jeremiah, 14, 18, 36 f., 91, 104
Jevons, F. B., 34 f., 192 ff
Job, 37, 42
John, Gospel of, 7, 75, 191, 205; apocalyptic, 226 f.
Jonah, 13 f., 37, 104
Jülicher, 2, 91, 95, 165

Kautzsch, 23

Lake, 4, 120
Legalism, O. T., 21 f.; Jewish literature, 26 f.; inadequate to the apocalyptist, 31, 39; and authority of Christ, 61 f.; and barren ethics, 83, 217; its exclusiveness, 24, 33, 37, 41 f., 83 f., 102 f., 111, 116; and forgiveness, 22, 62; New, 7, 116, 232
Loisy, 3, 5, 132

Mackintosh, H. R., 50, 59, 145
Makarios, 199 f.
Marshall, J. T., 88
Merit, doctrine of, 28 ff., 116, 214
Messiah, in Jewish Literature, 40 f.; in the Birth narratives, 43 f.; in the consciousness of Jesus, 50 f.
Modernists, 5, 225, 229
Moffatt, 43 f., 51 113, 162
Monotheism, 194, 234
Motive in God, 18; inspired, 176 f., 204, 225 ff.
Mozley, 124
Muirhead, 146
Mysteries, Greek, 35,
Mystery of Kingdom, 169 ff.

Nairne, 89, 94 f., 125
Newman, J. H., 229

Oesterley, 29 ff., 130
Orr, 50

Parable, two builders, 215; lost coin, 103; counting the cost, 223; drag-net, 138; Gracious-Father, 111, 165; marriage feast, 109; rich fool, 213; wedding garment, 218; two gates, 214; gathering of the nations, 144, 216; wicked husbandmen, 82; leaven, 169; mustard seed, 168; friend at midnight, 187; pearl, 174; Pharisee and publican, 114; pounds, 172; good Samaritan, 208, 217; great supper, 109; unjust judge, 187; unforgiving servant, 181; Sower, 166; seed growing secretly, 168; talents, 172; tares, 138; tower unfinished, 224; virgins, 139, 218
Paul, 1, 8, 115, 225, 228, 231 f.
Pfleiderer, 4, 58, 74, 77 f., 107, 113, 146 f., 194, 232, 234
Philosophy, Greek, 194, 227, 230
Plummer, 128

Prayer, 68, 153, 187; and evolution, 192; and ethics, 70, 186
Predestination, 26, 33
Psychical research, 196
Psycho-therapeutics, 122, 130, 133

Ransom, 80, 223
Revelation, 159 ff.
Robinson, H. W., 13, 163
Ryle, R. J., 122, 130

Sabbath, 23, 26, 65
Sacraments, 94 f., 165
Sacrifice, 22 f., 87 f.
Salmon, 148
Sanday, 3, 43, 47, 81
Schechter, 32, 105
Schmiedel, 59, 71, 126, 169
Schweitzer, 3 f., 96 f., 132, 134, 167 f., 170, 220
Scott, E. F., 219 f.
Servant, Suffering, 13, 17 f., 37; Jesus, 51, 55, 92, 133
Servant, unforgiving, 181
Sin, intentional, 23, 62; unintentional, 22 f.; in Synoptic gospels, 173, 230
Smith, G. A., 34, 105
Smith, W. R., 12
Son of Man in Enoch, 40 ff.; Jesus, 61 f., 145 f.
Spitta, 86
Stoicism, 194, 233
Swete, 72, 158

Thompson, 99, 119 ff.
Transfiguration, 69
Tylor, 34, 192

Virgin Birth, 44 f., 50
Votaw, 199, 201

Watson, 228
Weiss, B., 120, 163, 178
Weiss, J., 3
Wendland, 121 f.
Wuttke, 186

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY NEW YORK

PRINTED BY
WILLIAM BRENDON AND SON, LTD.
PLYMOUTH, ENGLAND

A SELECTION OF BOOKS PUBLISHED BY METHUEN AND CO. LTD. LONDON 36 ESSEX STREET W.C. 2

CONTENTS

	PAGE
General Literature	2
Ancient Cities	12
Antiquary's Books	12
Arden Shakespeare	13
Classics of Art	13
'Complete' Series	14
Connoisseur's Library	14
Handbooks of English Church History	15
Handbooks of Theology	15
Health Series	15
'Home Life' Series	15
Leaders of Religion	16
Library of Devotion	16
Little Books on Art	17
Little Guides	17
Little Library	18
Little Quarto Shakespeare	19
Miniature Library	19
New Library of Medicine	19
New Library of Music	20
Oxford Biographies	20
Nine Plays	20
Sport Series	20
States of Italy	20
Westminster Commentaries	20
'Young' Series	21
Cheap Library	21
Books for Travellers	22
Some Books on Art	22
Some Books on Italy	23
Fiction	24
Books for Boys and Girls	28
Cheap Novels	29
Shilling Novels	31

1918

A SELECTION OF

MESSRS. METHUEN'S PUBLICATIONS

IN this Catalogue the order is according to authors.

Colonial Editions are published of all Messrs. METHUEN'S Novels issued at a price above 4*s.* net, and similar editions are published of some works of General Literature. Colonial Editions are only for circulation in the British Colonies and India.

All books marked net are not subject to discount, and cannot be bought at less than the published price. Books not marked net are subject to the discount which the bookseller allows.

The prices in this Catalogue are liable to alteration without previous notice.

Messrs. METHUEN'S books are kept in stock by all good booksellers. If there is any difficulty in seeing copies, Messrs. Methuen will be very glad to have early information, and specimen copies of any books will be sent on receipt of the published price *plus* postage for net books, and of the published price for ordinary books.

This Catalogue contains only a selection of the more important books published by Messrs. Methuen. A complete catalogue of their publications may be obtained on application.

Andrewes (Lancelot). PRECES PRIVATAE. Translated and edited, with Notes, by F. E. BRIGHTMAN. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Aristotle. THE ETHICS. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by JOHN BURNET. *Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

Atkinson (T. D.). ENGLISH ARCHITECTURE. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

A GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN ENGLISH ARCHITECTURE. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Atteridge (A. H.). FAMOUS LAND FIGHTS. Illustrated. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Baggally (W. Wortley). TELEPATHY: GENUINE AND FRAUDULENT. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

Bain (F. W.). A DIGIT OF THE MOON: A HINDOO LOVE STORY. *Twelfth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

THE DESCENT OF THE SUN: A CYCLE OF BIRTH. *Seventh Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

A HEIFER OF THE DAWN. *Ninth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

IN THE GREAT GOD'S HAIR. *Sixth Edition. Fcap* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

A DRAUGHT OF THE BLUE. *Sixth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

AN ESSENCE OF THE DUSK. *Fourth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

AN INCARNATION OF THE SNOW. *Fourth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

A MINE OF FAULTS. *Fourth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

THE ASHES OF A GOD. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

BUBBLES OF THE FOAM. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 4*to.* 7*s.* 6*d. net. Also Fcap.* 8*vo* 5*s. net.*

A SYRUP OF THE BEES. *Fcap.* 4*to.* 7*s.* 6*d. net. Also Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

THE LIVERY OF EVE. *Second Edition. Fcap* 4*to.* 7*s.* 6*d. net. Also Fcap* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

Balfour (Graham). THE LIFE OF ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. *Fifteenth Edition. In one Volume. Cr.* 8*vo. Buckram,* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Baring (Hon. Maurice). LANDMARKS IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE. *Second Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

A YEAR IN RUSSIA. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Baring-Gould (S.). THE TRAGEDY OF THE CÆSARS: A STUDY OF THE CHARACTERS OF THE CÆSARS OF THE JULIAN AND CLAUDIAN HOUSES. Illustrated. *Seventh Editon. Royal* 8vo. 15*s. net.*

A BOOK OF CORNWALL. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

A BOOK OF DARTMOOR. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 7*s.* 6d. net.

A BOOK OF DEVON. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Baring-Gould (S.) and **Sheppard (H. F.).** A GARLAND OF COUNTRY SONG. English Folk Songs with their Traditional Melodies. *Demy* 4to. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Baring-Gould (S.), Sheppard (H. F.), and **Bussell (F. W.).** SONGS OF THE WEST. Folk Songs of Devon and Cornwall. Collected from the Mouths of the People. New and Revised Edition, under the musical editorship of CECIL J. SHARP. *Second Edition. Large Imperial* 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Barker (E.). GREEK POLITICAL THEORY: PLATO AND HIS PREDECESSORS. *Demy* 8vo. 14*s. net.*

Bastable (C. F.). THE COMMERCE OF NATIONS. *Eighth Edition. Cr* 8vo. 5*s. net.*

Beckford (Peter). THOUGHTS ON HUNTING. Edited by J. OTHO PAGET. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Demy* 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Belloc (H.). PARIS. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

HILLS AND THE SEA. *Ninth Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 6*s. net.*

ON NOTHING AND KINDRED SUBJECTS. *Fourth Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 6*s. net.*

ON EVERYTHING. *Fourth Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 6*s. net.*

ON SOMETHING. *Third Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 6*s. net.*

FIRST AND LAST. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 6*s. net.*

THIS AND THAT AND THE OTHER. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 6*s. net.*

MARIE ANTOINETTE. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Demy* 8vo. 18*s. net.*

THE PYRENEES. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Demy* 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Bennett (Arnold). THE TRUTH ABOUT AN AUTHOR. *Fcap.* 8vo. 5*s. net.*

Bennett (W. H.). A PRIMER OF THE BIBLE. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 4*s. net.*

Bennett (W. H.) and **Adeney (W. F.).** A BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION With a concise Bibliography. *Sixth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d. net. Also in Two Volumes. Cr.* 8vo. *Each* 5*s. net.*

Berriman (Algernon E.). AVIATION. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

MOTORING. Illustrated. *Demy* 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Bicknell (Ethel E.). PARIS AND HER TREASURES. Illustrated. *Fcap.* 8vo. *Round corners.* 6*s. net.*

Blake (William). ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE BOOK OF JOB. With a General Introduction by LAURENCE BINYON. Illustrated. *Quarto.* £1 1*s. net.*

Bloemfontein (Bishop of). ARA CŒLI: AN ESSAY IN MYSTICAL THEOLOGY. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 5*s. net.*

FAITH AND EXPERIENCE. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 5*s. net.*

THE CULT OF THE PASSING MOMENT. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 5*s. net.*

THE ENGLISH CHURCH AND REUNION. *Cr.* 8vo. 5*s. net.*

Brabant (F. G.). RAMBLES IN SUSSEX. Illustrated. *Cr.* 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Braid (James). ADVANCED GOLF. Illustrated. *Eighth Edition. Demy* 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Bulley (M. H.). ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL ART. Illustrated. *Cr.* 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Carlyle (Thomas). THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. Edited by C. R. L. FLETCHER. *Three Volumes. Cr.* 8vo. 18*s. net.*

THE LETTERS AND SPEECHES OF OLIVER CROMWELL. With an Introduction by C. H. FIRTH, and Notes and Appendices by S. C. LOMAS. *Three Volumes. Demy* 8vo. 18*s. net.*

Chambers (Mrs. Lambert). LAWN TENNIS FOR LADIES. Illustrated *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 5*s. net.*

Chesterton (G. K.). CHARLES DICKENS. With two Portraits in Photogravure. *Eighth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

THE BALLAD OF THE WHITE HORSE. *Fifth Edition. 6s. net.*

ALL THINGS CONSIDERED. *Tenth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

TREMENDOUS TRIFLES. *Fifth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

ALARMS AND DISCURSIONS. *Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

A MISCELLANY OF MEN. *Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

WINE, WATER, AND SONG. *Eighth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d. net.*

Clausen (George). ROYAL ACADEMY LECTURES ON PAINTING. Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Clutton-Brock (A.). THOUGHTS ON THE WAR. *Ninth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d. net.*

MORE THOUGHTS ON THE WAR. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d. net.*

Conrad (Joseph). THE MIRROR OF THE SEA: Memories and Impressions. *Fcap. 8vo. 5s. net.*

Coulton (G. G.). CHAUCER AND HIS ENGLAND. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*

Cowper (William). POEMS. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by J. C. BAILEY. Illustrated. *Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*

Cox (J. C.). RAMBLES IN SURREY. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

RAMBLES IN KENT. Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Davis (H. W. C.). ENGLAND UNDER THE NORMANS AND ANGEVINS: 1066–1272. *Fifth Edition. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*

Day (Harry A.), F.R.H.S. SPADECRAFT: OR, HOW TO BE GARDENER. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 2s net.*

VEGECULTURE: HOW TO GROW VEGETABLES, SALADS, AND HERBS IN TOWN AND COUNTRY. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 2s. net.*

THE FOOD-PRODUCING GARDEN. *Cr. 8vo. 2s. net.*

Dearmer (Mabel). A CHILD'S LIFE OF CHRIST. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Large Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Dickinson (G. L.). THE GREEK VIEW OF LIFE. *Eleventh Edition. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

Ditchfield (P. H.). THE VILLAGE CHURCH. *Second Edition.* Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE ENGLAND OF SHAKESPEARE. Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Dowden (J.). FURTHER STUDIES IN THE PRAYER BOOK. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Durham (The Earl of). THE REPORT ON CANADA. With an Introductory Note. *Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Egerton (H. E.). A SHORT HISTORY OF BRITISH COLONIAL POLICY. *Fifth Edition. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*

Fairbrother (W. H.). THE PHILOSOPHY OF T. H. GREEN. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

ffoulkes (Charles). THE ARMOURER AND HIS CRAFT. Illustrated. *Royal 4to. £2 2s. net.*

DECORATIVE IRONWORK. From the XIth to the XVIIIth Century. Illustrated. *Royal 4to. £2 2s. net.*

Firth (C. H.). CROMWELL'S ARMY. A History of the English Soldier during the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth, and the Protectorate. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Fisher (H. A. L.). THE REPUBLICAN TRADITION IN EUROPE. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

FitzGerald (Edward). THE RUBÁIYÁT OF OMAR KHAYYÁM. Printed from the Fifth and last Edition. With a Commentary by H. M. BATSON, and a Biographical Introduction by E. D. ROSS. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Flux (A. W.). ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*

Fyleman (Rose). FAIRIES AND CHIMNEYS. *Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

Gibbins (H. de B.). INDUSTRY IN ENGLAND: HISTORICAL OUTLINES. With Maps and Plans. *Ninth Edition. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*

THE INDUSTRIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND. With 5 Maps and a Plan. *Twenty-third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

Gibbon (Edward). THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. Edited, with Notes, Appendices, and Maps, by J. B. BURY. Illustrated. *Seven Volumes. Demy* 8*vo.* Illustrated. *Each* 12*s.* 6*d. net. Also in Seven Volumes. Cr.* 8*vo. Each* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Gladstone (W. Ewart). GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES: DESCRIPTIVE INDEX AND BIBLIOGRAPHY. Edited by A. TILNEY BASSETT. With a Preface by VISCOUNT BRYCE, O.M. *Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Glover (T. R.). THE CONFLICT OF RELIGIONS IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE. *Seventh Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

POETS AND PURITANS. *Second Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

FROM PERICLES TO PHILIP. *Second Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

VIRGIL. *Third Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION AND ITS VERIFICATION. (The Angus Lecture for 1912.) *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Grahame (Kenneth). THE WIND IN THE WILLOWS. *Eighth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Griffin (W. Hall) and Minchin (H. C.). THE LIFE OF ROBERT BROWNING. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Haig (K. G.). HEALTH THROUGH DIET. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Hale (J. R.). FAMOUS SEA FIGHTS: FROM SALAMIS TO TSU-SHIMA. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Hall (H. R.). THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE NEAR EAST FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 16*s. net.*

Hannay (D.). A SHORT HISTORY OF THE ROYAL NAVY. Vol. I., 1217–1688. *Second Edition.* Vol. II., 1689–1815. *Demy* 8*vo. Each* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Harker (Alfred). THE NATURAL HISTORY OF IGNEOUS ROCKS. With 112 Diagrams and 2 Plates. *Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

Harper (Charles G.). THE 'AUTOCAR' ROAD-BOOK. With Maps. *Four Volumes. Cr.* 8*vo. Each* 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

I.—SOUTH OF THE THAMES.

II.—NORTH AND SOUTH WALES AND WEST MIDLANDS.

III.—EAST ANGLIA AND EAST MIDLANDS.

IV.—THE NORTH OF ENGLAND AND SOUTH OF SCOTLAND.

Hasaall (Arthur). THE LIFE OF NAPOLEON. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Henley (W. E.). ENGLISH LYRICS: CHAUCER TO POE. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Hill (George Francis). ONE HUNDRED MASTERPIECES OF SCULPTURE. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Hobhouse (L. T.). THE THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE. *Second Edition Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

Hobson (J. A.). INTERNATIONAL TRADE: AN APPLICATION OF ECONOMIC THEORY. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

PROBLEMS OF POVERTY: AN INQUIRY INTO THE INDUSTRIAL CONDITION OF THE POOR. *Eighth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

THE PROBLEM OF THE UNEMPLOYED: AN INQUIRY AND AN ECONOMIC POLICY. *Sixth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

GOLD, PRICES AND WAGES: WITH AN EXAMINATION OF THE QUANTITY THEORY. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

Hodgson (Mrs. W.). HOW TO IDENTIFY OLD CHINESE PORCELAIN. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Post* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Holdsworth (W. S.). A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LAW. *Four Volumes. Vols. I., II., III. Each Second Edition. Demy* 8*vo. Each* 15*s. net.*

Hutt (C. W.). CROWLEY'S HYGIENE OF SCHOOL LIFE. Illustrated. *Second and Revised Edition. Cr* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Hutton (Edward). THE CITIES OF UMBRIA. Illustrated. *Fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

THE CITIES OF LOMBARDY. Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

THE CITIES OF ROMAGNA AND THE MARCHES. Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

FLORENCE AND NORTHERN TUSCANY, WITH GENOA. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

SIENA AND SOUTHERN TUSCANY. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

VENICE AND VENETIA. Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

NAPLES AND SOUTHERN ITALY. Illustrated. *Cr 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

ROME. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

COUNTRY WALKS ABOUT FLORENCE. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE CITIES OF SPAIN. Illustrated. *Fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Ibsen (Henrik). BRAND. A Dramatic Poem, translated by WILLIAM WILSON. *Fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

Inge (W. R.). CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM. (The Bampton Lectures of 1899.) *Fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6a. net.*

Innes (A. D.). A HISTORY OF THE BRITISH IN INDIA. With Maps and Plans. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

ENGLAND UNDER THE TUDORS. With Maps. *Fifth Edition. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*

Innes (Mary). SCHOOLS OF PAINTING. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Jenks (E.). AN OUTLINE OF ENGLISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT. *Third Edition.* Revised by R. C. K. ENSOR. *Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

A SHORT HISTORY OF ENGLISH LAW: FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE END OF THE YEAR 1911. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*

Johnston (Sir H. H.). BRITISH CENTRAL AFRICA. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr. 4to. 18s. net.*

THE NEGRO IN THE NEW WORLD. Illustrated. *Crown 4to. £1 1s. net.*

Julian (Lady) of Norwich. REVELATIONS OF DIVINE LOVE. Edited by GRACE WARRACK. *Sixth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

Keats (John). POEMS. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by E. de SÉLINCOURT. With a Frontispiece in Photogravure. *Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*

Keble (John). THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. With an Introduction and Notes by W. LOCK. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 5s. net.*

Kelynack (T. N.), M.D., M.R.C.P. THE DRINK PROBLEM OF TO-DAY IN ITS MEDICO-SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS. *Second and Revised Edition. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*

Kidd (Benjamin). THE SCIENCE OF POWER. *Fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Kipling (Rudyard). BARRACK-ROOM BALLADS. *189th Thousand. Cr. 8vo. Buckram, 7s. 6d. net. Also Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, 6s. net; leather, 7s. 6d. net.*
Also a Service Edition. *Two Volumes. Square fcap. 8vo. Each 3s. net.*

THE SEVEN SEAS. *140th Thousand. Cr. 8vo. Buckram, 7s. 6d. net. Also Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, 6s. net; leather, 7s. 6d. net.*
Also a Service Edition. *Two Volumes. Square fcap. 8vo. Each 3s. net.*

THE FIVE NATIONS. *120th Thousand. Cr. 8vo. Buckram, 7s. 6d. net. Also Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, 6s. net; leather, 7s. 6d. net.*
Also a Service Edition. *Two Volumes. Square fcap. 8vo. Each 3s. net.*

DEPARTMENTAL DITTIES. *84th Thousand. Cr. 8vo. Buckram, 7s. 6d. net. Also Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, 6s. net; leather, 7s. 6d. net.*
Also a Service Edition. *Two Volumes. Square fcap. 8vo. Each 3s. net.*

HYMN BEFORE ACTION. Illuminated. *Fcap. 4to. 1s. 6d. net.*

RECESSIONAL. Illuminated. *Fcap. 4to. 1s. 6d net.*

TWENTY POEMS FROM RUDYARD KIPLING. *36oth Thousand. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. net.*

Lamb (Charles and **Mary).** THE COMPLETE WORKS. Edited by E. V. LUCAS. *A New and Revised Edition in Six Volumes. With Frontispieces. Fcap. 8vo. Each 6s. net.*
The volumes are :—
I. MISCELLANEOUS PROSE. II. ELIA AND THE LAST ESSAYS OF ELIA. III. BOOKS FOR CHILDREN. IV. PLAYS AND POEMS. V. and VI. LETTERS.

Lane-Poole (Stanley). A HISTORY OF EGYPT IN THE MIDDLE AGES. Illustrated. *Second Edition, Revised. Cr 8vo. 9s. net.*

Lankester (Sir Ray). SCIENCE FROM AN EASY CHAIR. Illustrated. *Eighth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

SCIENCE FROM AN EASY CHAIR. *Second Series.* Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

DIVERSIONS OF A NATURALIST. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Lewis (Edward). EDWARD CARPENTER: AN EXPOSITION AND AN APPRECIATION. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Lock (Walter). ST. PAUL, THE MASTER BUILDER. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

THE BIBLE AND CHRISTIAN LIFE. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Lodge (Sir Oliver). MAN AND THE UNIVERSE: A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE ADVANCE IN SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE UPON OUR UNDERSTANDING OF CHRISTIANITY. *Ninth Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

THE SURVIVAL OF MAN: A STUDY IN UNRECOGNISED HUMAN FACULTY. *Seventh Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

MODERN PROBLEMS. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

RAYMOND; OR, LIFE AND DEATH. Illustrated. *Ninth Edition. Demy 8vo. 15s. net.*

THE WAR AND AFTER: SHORT CHAPTERS ON SUBJECTS OF SERIOUS PRACTICAL IMPORT FOR THE AVERAGE CITIZEN IN A.D. 1915 ONWARDS. *Eighth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 9d. net.*

Loreburn (Earl). CAPTURE AT SEA. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.*

Lorimer (George Horace). LETTERS FROM A SELF-MADE MERCHANT TO HIS SON. Illustrated. *Twenty-fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

OLD GORGON GRAHAM. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Lorimer (Norma). BY THE WATERS OF EGYPT. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d net.*

Lucas (E. V.). THE LIFE OF CHARLES LAMB. Illustrated. *Sixth Edition. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*

A WANDERER IN HOLLAND. Illustrated. *Sixteenth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 8s. 6d. net.*

A WANDERER IN LONDON. Illustrated. *Eighteenth Edition, Revised. Cr. 8vo. 8s. 6d. net.*

LONDON REVISITED. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 8s. 6d. net.*

A WANDERER IN PARIS. Illustrated. *Thirteenth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 8s. 6d. net. Also Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

A WANDERER IN FLORENCE. Illustrated. *Sixth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 8s. 6d. net.*

A WANDERER IN VENICE. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 8s. 6d. net.*

THE OPEN ROAD: A LITTLE BOOK FOR WAYFARERS. *Twenty-seventh Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net. India Paper, 7s. 6d. net. Also Illustrated. Cr. 4to. 15s. net.*

THE FRIENDLY TOWN: A LITTLE BOOK FOR THE URBANE. *Ninth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

FIRESIDE AND SUNSHINE. *Ninth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

CHARACTER AND COMEDY. *Eighth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE GENTLEST ART: A CHOICE OF LETTERS BY ENTERTAINING HANDS. *Tenth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE SECOND POST. *Fifth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

HER INFINITE VARIETY: A FEMININE PORTRAIT GALLERY. *Eighth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

GOOD COMPANY: A RALLY OF MEN. *Fourth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

ONE DAY AND ANOTHER. *Seventh Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

OLD LAMPS FOR NEW. *Sixth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

LOITERER'S HARVEST. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

CLOUD AND SILVER. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

LISTENER'S LURE: AN OBLIQUE NARRATION. *Twelfth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

OVER BEMERTON'S: AN EASY-GOING CHRONICLE. *Sixteenth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

MR. INGLESIDE. *Twelfth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

LONDON LAVENDER. *Twelfth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

LANDMARKS. *Fifth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE BRITISH SCHOOL: AN ANECDOTAL GUIDE TO THE BRITISH PAINTERS AND PAINTINGS IN THE NATIONAL GALLERY. *Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

A BOSWELL OF BAGHDAD, AND OTHER ESSAYS. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

'TWIXT EAGLE AND DOVE. *Fcap. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Lydekker (R.). THE OX AND ITS KINDRED. Illustrated. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Macaulay (Lord). CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS. Edited by F. C. MONTAGUE. *Three Volumes. Cr.* 8*vo.* 18*s. net*

Macdonald (J. R. M.). A HISTORY OF FRANCE. *Three Volumes. Cr.* 8*vo. Each* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

McDougall (William). AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. *Twelfth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

BODY AND MIND: A HISTORY AND A DEFENCE OF ANIMISM. *Fourth Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Maeterlinck (Maurice). THE BLUE BIRD: A FAIRY PLAY IN SIX ACTS. Translated by ALEXANDER TEIXEIRA DE MATTOS. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.* An Edition, illustrated in colour by F. CAYLEY ROBINSON, is also published. *Cr.* 4*to.* £1 1*s. net. Also Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 9*d. net.* Of the above book Thirty-nine Editions in all have been issued.

MARY MAGDALENE: A PLAY IN THREE ACTS. Translated by ALEXANDER TEIXEIRA DE MATTOS. *Third Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net. Also Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 9*d. net.*

DEATH. Translated by ALEXANDER TEIXEIRA DE MATTOS. *Fourth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

OUR ETERNITY. Translated by ALEXANDER TEIXEIRA DE MATTOS. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE UNKNOWN GUEST. Translated by ALEXANDER TEIXEIRA DE MATTOS. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

POEMS. Done into English Verse by BERNARD MIALL. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

THE WRACK OF THE STORM. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE MIRACLE OF ST. ANTHONY: A PLAY IN ONE ACT. Translated by ALEXANDER TEIXEIRA DE MATTOS. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

THE BURGOMASTER OF STILEMONDE: A PLAY IN THREE ACTS. Translated by ALEXANDER TEIXEIRA DE MATTOS. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

Mahaffy (J. P.). A HISTORY OF EGYPT UNDER THE PTOLEMAIC DYNASTY. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 9*s. net.*

Maitland (F. W.). ROMAN CANON LAW IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Royal* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Marett (R. R.). THE THRESHOLD OF RELIGION. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Marriott (J. A. R.). ENGLAND SINCE WATERLOO. With Maps. *Second Edition, Revised. Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Masefield (John). A SAILOR'S GARLAND. Selected and Edited. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Masterman (C. F. G.). TENNYSON AS A RELIGIOUS TEACHER. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Medley (D. J.). ORIGINAL ILLUSTRATIONS OF ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Miles (Eustace). LIFE AFTER LIFE; OR, THE THEORY OF REINCARNATION. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

THE POWER OF CONCENTRATION: HOW TO ACQUIRE IT. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

PREVENTION AND CURE. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

Miles (Mrs. Eustace). HEALTH WITHOUT MEAT. *Sixth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d. net.*

Millais (J. G.). THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF SIR JOHN EVERETT MILLAIS. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Milne (J. G.). A HISTORY OF EGYPT UNDER ROMAN RULE. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 9*s. net.*

Money (Sir Leo Chiozza). RICHES AND POVERTY, 1910. *Eleventh Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

Montague (C. E.). DRAMATIC VALUES. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

Noyes (Alfred). A SALUTE FROM THE FLEET, AND OTHER POEMS. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

RADA: A BELGIAN CHRISTMAS EVE. Illustrated. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

Oman (C. W. C.). A HISTORY OF THE ART OF WAR IN THE MIDDLE AGES. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

ENGLAND BEFORE THE NORMAN CONQUEST. With Maps. *Third Edition, Revised. Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Oxenham (John). BEES IN AMBER: A LITTLE BOOK OF THOUGHTFUL VERSE. *228th Thousand. Small Pott 8vo. Paper 1s. 3d. net; Cloth Boards, 2s. net; Leather Yapp, 3s. 6d. net.*
Also Illustrated. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

ALL'S WELL: A COLLECTION OF WAR POEMS. *175th Thousand. Small Pott 8vo. Paper, 1s. 3d. net; Cloth Boards, 2s. net; Leather Yapp, 3s. 6d. net.*
Also Illustrated. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

THE KING'S HIGH WAY. *120th Thousand. Small Pott 8vo. 1s. 3d. net; Cloth Boards, 2s. net; Leather Yapp, 3s. 6d. net.*

THE VISION SPLENDID. *100th Thousand. Small Pott 8vo. Paper, 1s. 3d. net; Cloth Boards, 2s. net; Leather Yapp, 3s. 6d. net.*

THE FIERY CROSS. *80th Thousand. Small Pott 8vo. Paper, 1s. 3d. net; Cloth Boards, 2s. net; Leather Yapp, 3s. 6d. net.*

HIGH ALTARS: THE RECORD OF A VISIT TO THE BATTLEFIELDS OF FRANCE AND FLANDERS. *40th Thousand. Small Pott 8vo. 1s. 3d. net; Cloth Boards, 2s. net.*

Oxford (M. N.). A HANDBOOK OF NURSING. *Seventh Edition, Revised. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

Pakes (W. C. C.). THE SCIENCE OF HYGIENE. Illustrated. *Second and Cheaper Edition.* Revised by A. T. NANKIVELL. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Petrie (W. M. Flinders.) A HISTORY OF EGYPT. Illustrated. *Six Volumes. Cr. 8vo. Each 9s. net.*

VOL. I. FROM THE 1ST TO THE XVITH DYNASTY. *Eighth Edition.*

VOL. II. THE XVIITH AND XVIIITH DYNASTIES. *Sixth Edition.*

VOL. III. XIXTH TO XXXTH DYNASTIES. *Second Edition.*

VOL. IV. EGYPT UNDER THE PTOLEMAIC DYNASTY. J. P. MAHAFFY. *Second Edition.*

VOL. V. EGYPT UNDER ROMAN RULE. J. G. MILNE. *Second Edition.*

VOL. VI. EGYPT IN THE MIDDLE AGES. STANLEY LANE POOLE. *Second Edition.*

RELIGION AND CONSCIENCE IN ANCIENT EGYPT. Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

SYRIA AND EGYPT, FROM THE TELL EL AMARNA LETTERS. *Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

EGYPTIAN TALES. Translated from the Papyri. First Series, IVth to XIIth Dynasty. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

EGYPTIAN TALES. Translated from the Papyri. Second Series, XVIIIth to XIXth Dynasty. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

Pollard (Alfred W.). SHAKESPEARE FOLIOS AND QUARTOS. A Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays, 1594–1685. Illustrated. *Folio. £1 1s. net.*

Porter (G. R.). THE PROGRESS OF THE NATION. A New Edition. Edited by F. W. HIRST. *Demy 8vo. £1 1s. net.*

Power (J. O'Connor). THE MAKING OF AN ORATOR. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Price (L. L.). A SHORT HISTORY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY IN ENGLAND FROM ADAM SMITH TO ARNOLD TOYNBEE. *Ninth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.*

Rawlings (Gertrude B.). COINS AND HOW TO KNOW THEM. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Regan (C. Tate). THE FRESHWATER FISHES OF THE BRITISH ISLES. Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Reid (G. Archdall). THE LAWS OF HEREDITY. *Second Edition. Demy 8vo. £1 1s. net.*

Robertson (C. Grant). SELECT STATUTES, CASES, AND DOCUMENTS, 1660–1832. *Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Demy 8vo. 15s. net.*

ENGLAND UNDER THE HANOVERIANS. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*

Rolle (Richard). THE FIRE OF LOVE AND THE MENDING OF LIFE. Edited by FRANCES M. COMPER. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Ryley (A. Beresford). OLD PASTE. Illustrated. *Royal 8vo. £2 2s. net.*

'Saki' (H. H. Munro). REGINALD. *Fourth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

REGINALD IN RUSSIA. *Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

Schidrowitz (Philip). RUBBER. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 15s. net.*

Selous (Edmund). TOMMY SMITH'S ANIMALS. Illustrated. *Sixteenth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

TOMMY SMITH'S OTHER ANIMALS. Illustrated. *Seventh Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

JACK'S INSECTS. Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Shakespeare (William).
THE FOUR FOLIOS, 1623; 1632; 1664; 1685. Each £4 4s. *net*, or a complete set, £12 12s. *net.*

THE POEMS OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. With an Introduction and Notes by GEORGE WYNDHAM. *Demy* 8vo. *Buckram*, 12s. 6d. *net.*

Shelley (Percy Bysshe). POEMS. With an Introduction by A. CLUTTON-BROCK and notes by C. D. LOCOCK. *Two Volumes. Demy* 8vo. £1 1s. *net.*

Sladen (Douglas). SICILY: THE NEW WINTER RESORT. An Encyclopædia of Sicily. With 234 Illustrations, a Map, and a Table of the Railway System of Sicily. *Second Edition, Revised. Cr.* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

Slesser (H. H.). TRADE UNIONISM. *Cr.* 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Smith (Adam). THE WEALTH OF NATIONS. Edited by EDWIN CANNAN. *Two Volumes. Demy* 8vo. £1 5s. *net.*

Smith (G. F. Herbert). GEM-STONES AND THEIR DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERS. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

Stancliffe. GOLF DO'S AND DONT'S. *Sixth Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 2s. *net.*

Stevenson (R. L.). THE LETTERS OF ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. Edited by Sir SIDNEY COLVIN. *A New Re-arranged Edition in four volumes. Fourth Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. *Each* 6s. *net. Leather, each* 7s. 6d. *net.*

Surtees (R. S.). HANDLEY CROSS. Illustrated. *Eighth Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

MR. SPONGE'S SPORTING TOUR. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

ASK MAMMA; OR, THE RICHEST COMMONER IN ENGLAND. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

JORROCKS'S JAUNTS AND JOLLITIES. Illustrated. *Sixth Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

MR. FACEY ROMFORD'S HOUNDS. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

HAWBUCK GRANGE; OR, THE SPORTING ADVENTURES OF THOMAS SCOTT, ESQ. Illustrated. *Fcap.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

PLAIN OR RINGLETS? Illustrated. *Fcap.* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

HILLINGDON HALL. With 12 Coloured Plates by WILDRAKE, HEATH, and JELLICOE. *Fcap.* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

Suso (Henry). THE LIFE OF THE BLESSED HENRY SUSO. By HIMSELF. Translated by T. F. KNOX. With an Introduction by DEAN INGE. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Swanton (E. W.). FUNGI AND HOW TO KNOW THEM. Illustrated. *Cr.* 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

BRITISH PLANT-GALLS. *Cr.* 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

Tabor (Margaret E.). THE SAINTS IN ART. With their Attributes and Symbols Alphabetically Arranged. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 5s. *net.*

Taylor (A. E.). ELEMENTS OF METAPHYSICS. *Fourth Edition. Demy* 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

Taylor (J. W.). THE COMING OF THE SAINTS. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Thomas (Edward). MAURICE MAETERLINCK. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

A LITERARY PILGRIM IN ENGLAND. Illustrated. *Demy* 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

Tileston (Mary W.). DAILY STRENGTH FOR DAILY NEEDS. *Twenty-fifth Edition. Medium* 16mo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Toynbee (Paget). DANTE ALIGHIERI. HIS LIFE AND WORKS. With 16 Illustrations. *Fourth and Enlarged Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Trevelyan (G. M.). ENGLAND UNDER THE STUARTS. With Maps and Plans. *Seventh Edition. Demy* 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

Triggs (H. Inigo). TOWN PLANNING: PAST, PRESENT, AND POSSIBLE. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Wide Royal* 8vo. 16s. *net.*

Underhill (Evelyn). MYSTICISM. A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness. *Seventh Edition. Demy* 8vo. 15s. *net.*

Vardon (Harry). HOW TO PLAY GOLF. Illustrated. *Eleventh Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 5s. *net.*

Vernon (Hon. W. Warren). READINGS ON THE INFERNO OF DANTE. With an Introduction by the Rev. Dr. MOORE. *Two Volumes. Second Edition, Rewritten. Cr.* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

READINGS ON THE PURGATORIO OF DANTE. With an Introduction by the late DEAN CHURCH. *Two Volumes. Third Edition, Revised. Cr.* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

READINGS ON THE PARADISO OF DANTE. With an Introduction by the BISHOP OF RIPON. *Two Volumes. Second Edition, Revised. Cr.* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

Vickers (Kenneth H.). ENGLAND IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES. With Maps. *Second Edition, Revised. Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Waddell (L. A.). LHASA AND ITS MYSTERIES. With a Record of the Expedition of 1903–1904. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Medium* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Wade (G. W. and J. H.). RAMBLES IN SOMERSET. Illustrated. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Wagner (Richard). RICHARD WAGNER'S MUSIC DRAMAS. Interpretations, embodying Wagner's own explanations. By ALICE LEIGHTON CLEATHER and BASIL CRUMP. *Fcap.* 8*vo. Each* 4*s. net.*

THE RING OF THE NIBELUNG. *Sixth Edition.*

LOHENGRIN AND PARSIFAL. *Third Edition.*

TRISTAN AND ISOLDE. *Second Edition.*

TANNHÄUSER AND THE MASTERSINGERS OF NUREMBURG.

Waterhouse (Elizabeth). WITH THE SIMPLE-HEARTED. Little Homilies. *Third Edition. Small Pott* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

THE HOUSE BY THE CHERRY TREE. A Second Series of Little Homilies. *Small Pott* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPANIONS OF THE WAY. Being Selections for Morning and Evening Reading. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

THOUGHTS OF A TERTIARY. *Second Edition. Small Pott* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d. net.*

VERSES. *Second Edition, Enlarged. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s. net.*

A LITTLE BOOK OF LIFE AND DEATH. *Nineteenth Edition. Small Pott* 8*vo. Cloth,* 2*s.* 6*d. net; Velvet Leather Yapp,* 6*s. net.*

Waters (W. G.). ITALIAN SCULPTORS. Illustrated. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Watt (Francis). CANTERBURY PILGRIMS AND THEIR WAYS. With a Frontispiece in Colour and 12 other Illustrations. *Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Weigall (Arthur E. P.). A GUIDE TO THE ANTIQUITIES OF UPPER EGYPT: FROM ABYDOS TO THE SUDAN FRONTIER. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Wells (J.). A SHORT HISTORY OF ROME. *Sixteenth Edition.* With 3 Maps. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Wilde (Oscar). THE WORKS OF OSCAR WILDE. *Thirteen Volumes. Fcap.* 8*vo. Each* 6*s.* 6*d. net.*

I. LORD ARTHUR SAVILE'S CRIME AND THE PORTRAIT OF MR. W. H. II. THE DUCHESS OF PADUA. III. POEMS. IV. LADY WINDERMERE'S FAN. V. A WOMAN OF NO IMPORTANCE. VI. AN IDEAL HUSBAND. VII. THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING EARNEST. VIII. A HOUSE OF POMEGRANATES. IX. INTENTIONS. X. DE PROFUNDIS AND PRISON LETTERS. XI. ESSAYS. XII. SALOMÉ, A FLORENTINE TRAGEDY, and LA SAINTE COURTISANE. XIII. SELECTED PROSE OF OSCAR WILDE.

A HOUSE OF POMEGRANATES. Illustrated. *Cr.* 4*to.* 21*s. net.*

Wilding (Anthony F). ON THE COURT AND OFF. With 58 Illustrations. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Wilson (Ernest H.). A NATURALIST IN WESTERN CHINA. Illustrated. *Second Edition.* 2 Vols. *Demy* 8*vo.* £1 10*s. net.*

Wood (Sir Evelyn). FROM MIDSHIPMAN TO FIELD-MARSHAL. Illustrated. *Fifth Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

THE REVOLT IN HINDUSTAN (1857-59). Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Wood (Lieut. W. B.) and **Edmonds (Col. J. E.).** A HISTORY OF THE CIVIL WAR IN THE UNITED STATES (1861–65). With an Introduction by SPENSER WILKINSON. With 24 Maps and Plans. *Third Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

Wordsworth (W.). POEMS. With an Introduction and Notes by NOWELL C. SMITH. *Three Volumes. Demy* 8*vo.* 18*s. net.*

Yeats (W. B.). A BOOK OF IRISH VERSE. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

PART II.—A SELECTION OF SERIES

Ancient Cities

General Editor, SIR B. C. A. WINDLE

Cr. 8vo. 6s. net each volume

With Illustrations by E. H. NEW, and other Artists

BRISTOL. Alfred Harvey.

CANTERBURY. J. C. Cox.

CHESTER. Sir B. C. A. Windle.

DUBLIN. S. A. O. Fitzpatrick.

EDINBURGH. M. G. Williamson.

LINCOLN. E. Mansel Sympson.

SHREWSBURY. T. Auden.

WELLS and GLASTONBURY. T. S. Holmes.

The Antiquary's Books

General Editor, J. CHARLES COX

Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net each volume

With Numerous Illustrations

ANCIENT PAINTED GLASS IN ENGLAND. Philip Nelson.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND FALSE ANTIQUITIES. R. Munro.

BELLS OF ENGLAND, THE. Canon J. J. Raven. *Second Edition.*

BRASSES OF ENGLAND, THE. Herbert W. Macklin. *Third Edition.*

CASTLES AND WALLED TOWNS OF ENGLAND, THE. A. Harvey.

CELTIC ART IN PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN TIMES. J. Romilly Allen. *Second Edition.*

CHURCHWARDENS' ACCOUNTS. J. C. Cox.

DOMESDAY INQUEST, THE. Adolphus Ballard.

ENGLISH CHURCH FURNITURE. J. C. Cox and A. Harvey. *Second Edition.*

ENGLISH COSTUME. From Prehistoric Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century. George Clinch.

ENGLISH MONASTIC LIFE. Cardinal Gasquet. *Fourth Edition.*

ENGLISH SEALS. J. Harvey Bloom.

FOLK-LORE AS AN HISTORICAL SCIENCE. Sir G. L. Gomme.

GILDS AND COMPANIES OF LONDON, THE. George Unwin.

HERMITS AND ANCHORITES OF ENGLAND, THE. Rotha Mary Clay.

MANOR AND MANORIAL RECORDS, THE. Nathaniel J. Hone. *Second Edition.*

MEDIÆVAL HOSPITALS OF ENGLAND, THE. Rotha Mary Clay.

OLD ENGLISH INSTRUMENTS OF MUSIC F. W. Galpin. *Second Edition.*

The Antiquary's Books—*continued*

OLD ENGLISH LIBRARIES. Ernest A. Savage.

OLD SERVICE BOOKS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH. Christopher Wordsworth, and Henry Littlehales. *Second Edition.*

PARISH LIFE IN MEDIÆVAL ENGLAND. Cardinal Gasquet. *Fourth Edition.*

PARISH REGISTERS OF ENGLAND, THE. J. C. Cox.

REMAINS OF THE PREHISTORIC AGE IN ENGLAND. Sir B. C. A. Windle. *Second Edition.*

ROMAN ERA IN BRITAIN, THE. J. Ward.

ROMANO-BRITISH BUILDINGS AND EARTHWORKS. J. Ward.

ROYAL FORESTS OF ENGLAND, THE. J. C. Cox.

SCHOOLS OF MEDIEVAL ENGLAND, THE. A. F. Leach. *Second Edition.*

SHRINES OF BRITISH SAINTS. J. C. Wall.

The Arden Shakespeare

General Editor—R. H. CASE

Demy 8vo. 6s. net each volume

An edition of Shakespeare in Single Plays; each edited with a full Introduction, Textual Notes, and a Commentary at the foot of the page

ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL.
ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA. *Third Edition.*
AS YOU LIKE IT.
CYMBELINE. *Second Edition.*
COMEDY OF ERRORS, THE.
HAMLET. *Fourth Edition.*
JULIUS CAESAR. *Second Edition.*
KING HENRY IV. PT. I.
KING HENRY V. *Second Edition.*
KING HENRY VI. PT. I.
KING HENRY VI. PT. II.
KING HENRY VI. PT. III
KING HENRY VIII.
KING LEAR. *Second Edition.*
KING RICHARD II.
KING RICHARD III. *Second Edition.*
LIFE AND DEATH OF KING JOHN, THE.
LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST. *Second Edition.*
MACBETH. *Second Edition.*
MEASURE FOR MEASURE.
MERCHANT OF VENICE, THE. *Fourth Edition.*
MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR, THE.
MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM, A.
OTHELLO. *Second Edition.*
PERICLES.
ROMEO AND JULIET. *Second Edition.*
SONNETS AND A LOVER'S COMPLAINT.
TAMING OF THE SHREW, THE.
TEMPEST, THE. *Second Edition.*
TIMON OF ATHENS.
TITUS ANDRONICUS.
TROILUS AND CRESSIDA.
TWELFTH NIGHT. *Third Edition.*
TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA, THE.
VENUS AND ADONIS.
WINTER'S TALE, THE.

Classics of Art

Edited by DR. J. H. W. LAING

With numerous Illustrations. Wide Royal 8vo

ART OF THE GREEKS, THE. H. B. Walters. 15*s. net.*

ART OF THE ROMANS, THE. H. B. Walters. 16*s. net.*

CHARDIN. H. E. A. Furst. 15*s. net.*

DONATELLO. Maud Cruttwell. 16*s. net.*

FLORENTINE SCULPTORS OF THE RENAISSANCE. Wilhelm Bode. Translated by Jessie Haynes. 15*s. net.*

GEORGE ROMNEY. Arthur B. Chamberlain. 15*s. net.*

Classics of Art—*continued*

GHIRLANDAIO. Gerald S. Davies. *Second Edition.* 15*s. net.*

LAWRENCE. Sir Walter Armstrong. 25*s net.*

MICHELANGELO. Gerald S. Davies. 15*s. net.*

RAPHAEL. A. P. Oppé. 15*s. net.*

REMBRANDT'S ETCHINGS. A. M. Hind. Two Volumes. 25*s. net.*

RUBENS. Edward Dillon. 30*s. net.*

TINTORETTO. Evelyn March Phillipps. 16*s. net.*

TITIAN. Charles Ricketts. 16*s. net.*

TURNER'S SKETCHES AND DRAWINGS. A. J. Finberg. *Second Edition.* 15*s. net.*

VELAZQUEZ. A. de Beruete. 15*s. net.*

The 'Complete' Series

Fully Illustrated. Demy 8vo

COMPLETE AMATEUR BOXER, THE. J. G. Bohun Lynch. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE ASSOCIATION FOOTBALLER, THE. B. S. Evers and C. E. Hughes-Davies. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE ATHLETIC TRAINER, THE. S. A. Mussabini. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE BILLIARD PLAYER, THE. Charles Roberts. 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE COOK, THE. Lilian Whitling. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE CRICKETER, THE. Albert E. KNIGHT. *Second Edition.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE FOXHUNTER, THE. Charles Richardson. *Second Edition.* 16*s. net.*

COMPLETE GOLFER, THE. Harry Vardon. *Fifteenth Edition, Revised.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE HOCKEY-PLAYER, THE. Eustace E. White. *Second Edition.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE HORSEMAN, THE. W. Scarth Dixon. *Second Edition.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE JUJITSUAN, THE. W. H. Garrud. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE LAWN TENNIS PLAYER, THE. A. Wallis Myers. *Fourth Edition.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE MOTORIST, THE. Filson Young and W. G. Aston. *Revised Edition.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE MOUNTAINEER, THE. G. D. Abraham. *Second Edition.* 16*s. net.*

COMPLETE OARSMAN, THE. R. C. Lehmann. 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE PHOTOGRAPHER, THE. R. Child Bayley. *Fifth Edition, Revised.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE RUGBY FOOTBALLER, ON THE NEW ZEALAND SYSTEM, THE. D. Gallaher and W. J. Stead. *Second Edition.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE SHOT, THE. G. T. Teasdale-Buckell. *Third Edition.* 16*s. net.*

COMPLETE SWIMMER, THE. F. Sachs. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

COMPLETE YACHTSMAN, THE. B. Heckstall-Smith and E. du Boulay. *Second Edition, Revised.* 16*s. net.*

The Connoisseur's Library

With numerous Illustrations. Wide Royal 8vo. 25s. net each volume

ENGLISH COLOURED BOOKS. Martin Hardie.

ENGLISH FURNITURE. F. S. Robinson. *Second Edition.*

ETCHINGS. Sir F. Wedmore. *Second Edition.*

EUROPEAN ENAMELS. Henry H. Cunynghame.

FINE BOOKS. A. W. Pollard.

GLASS. Edward Dillon.

GOLDSMITHS' AND SILVERSMITHS' WORK. Nelson Dawson. *Second Edition.*

ILLUMINATED MANUSCRIPTS. J. A. Herbert. *Second Edition.*

IVORIES. Alfred Maskell.

JEWELLERY. H. Clifford Smith. *Second Edition.*

MEZZOTINTS. Cyril Davenport.

MINIATURES. Dudley Heath.

PORCELAIN. Edward Dillon.

SEALS. Walter de Gray Birch.

WOOD SCULPTURE. Alfred Maskell.

Handbooks of English Church History

Edited by J. H. BURN. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s. net each volume*

FOUNDATIONS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, THE. J. H. Maude.

SAXON CHURCH AND THE NORMAN CONQUEST, THE. C. T. Cruttwell.

MEDIÆVAL CHURCH AND THE PAPACY, THE. A. C. Jennings.

REFORMATION PERIOD, THE. Henry Gee.

STRUGGLE WITH PURITANISM, THE. Bruce Blaxland.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, THE. Alfred Plummer.

Handbooks of Theology

Demy 8vo

DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION, THE. R. L. Ottley. *Fifth Edition.* 15*s. net.*

HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, A. J. F. Bethune-Baker. 15*s. net.*

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION, AN. F. B. Jevons. *Seventh Edition.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE CREEDS, AN. A. E. Burn. 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA, THE. Alfred Caldecott. 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

XXXIX ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, THE. Edited by E. C. S. Gibson. *Ninth Edition.* 15*s. net.*

Health Series

Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d. net*

BABY, THE. Arthur Saunders.

CARE OF THE BODY, THE. F. Cavanagh.

CARE OF THE TEETH, THE. A. T. Pitts.

EYES OF OUR CHILDREN, THE. N. Bishop Harman.

HEALTH FOR THE MIDDLE-AGED. Seymour Taylor. *Third Edition.*

HEALTH OF A WOMAN, THE. R. Murray Leslie.

HEALTH OF THE SKIN, THE. George Pernet.

HOW TO LIVE LONG. J. Walter Carr.

PREVENTION OF THE COMMON COLD, THE. O. K. Williamson.

STAYING THE PLAGUE. N. Bishop Harman.

THROAT AND EAR TROUBLES. Macleod Yearsley. *Third Edition.*

TUBERCULOSIS. Clive Riviere.

HEALTH OF THE CHILD, THE. *Second Edition.* O. Hilton. 2*s. net.*

The 'Home Life' Series

Illustrated. Demy 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d. net to* 12*s.* 6*d. net*

HOME LIFE IN AMERICA. Katherine G. Busbey. *Second Edition.*

HOME LIFE IN CHINA. I. Taylor Headland.

HOME LIFE IN FRANCE. Miss Betham-Edwards. *Sixth Edition.*

HOME LIFE IN GERMANY. Mrs. A. Sidgwick. *Third Edition.*

HOME LIFE IN HOLLAND. D. S. Meldrum. *Second Edition.*

HOME LIFE IN ITALY. Lina Duff Gordon. *Third Edition.*

HOME LIFE IN NORWAY. H. K. Daniels. *Second Edition.*

HOME LIFE IN RUSSIA. A. S. Rappoport.

HOME LIFE IN SPAIN. S. L. Bensusan. *Second Edition.*

BALKAN HOME LIFE. Lucy M. J. Garnett.

Leaders of Religion

Edited by H. C. BEECHING. *With Portraits*

Crown 8vo. 3s. net each volume

CARDINAL NEWMAN. R. H. Hutton.

JOHN WESLEY. J. H. Overton.

BISHOP WILBERFORCE. G. W. Daniell.

CARDINAL MANNING. A. W. Hutton. *Second Edition.*

CHARLES SIMEON. H. C. G. Moule.

JOHN KNOX. F. MacCunn. *Second Edition.*

JOHN HOWE. R. F. Horton.

THOMAS KEN. F. A. Clarke.

GEORGE FOX, THE QUAKER. T. Hodgkin. *Third Edition.*

JOHN KEBLE. Walter Lock. *Seventh Edition.*

THOMAS CHALMERS. Mrs. Oliphant. *Second Edition.*

LANCELOT ANDREWES. R. L. Ottley. *Second Edition.*

AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY. E. L. Cutts.

WILLIAM LAUD. W. H. Hutton. *Fourth Edition.*

JOHN DONNE. Augustus Jessop.

THOMAS CRANMER. A. J. Mason.

LATIMER. R. M. and A. J. Carlyle.

BISHOP BUTLER. W. A. Spooner.

The Library of Devotion

With Introductions and (where necessary) Notes

Small Pott 8vo, cloth, 3s. net; also some volumes in leather, 3s. 6d. net each volume

CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE, THE. *Ninth Edition.*

IMITATION OF CHRIST, THE. *Eighth Edition.*

CHRISTIAN YEAR, THE. *Fifth Edition.*

LYRA INNOCENTIUM. *Third Edition.*

TEMPLE, THE. *Second Edition.*

BOOK OF DEVOTIONS, A. *Second Edition.*

SERIOUS CALL TO A DEVOUT AND HOLY LIFE, A. *Fifth Edition.*

GUIDE TO ETERNITY, A.

INNER WAY, THE. *Third Edition.*

ON THE LOVE OF GOD.

PSALMS OF DAVID, THE.

LYRA APOSTOLICA.

SONG OF SONGS, THE.

THOUGHTS OF PASCAL, THE. *Second Edition.*

MANUAL OF CONSOLATION FROM THE SAINTS AND FATHERS, A.

DEVOTIONS FROM THE APOCRYPHA.

SPIRITUAL COMBAT, THE.

DEVOTIONS OF ST. ANSELM, THE.

BISHOP WILSON'S SACRA PRIVATA.

GRACE ABOUNDING TO THE CHIEF OF SINNERS.

LYRA SACRA. A Book of Sacred Verse. *Second Edition.*

DAY BOOK FROM THE SAINTS AND FATHERS, A.

LITTLE BOOK OF HEAVENLY WISDOM, A. A Selection from the English Mystics.

LIGHT, LIFE, and LOVE. A Selection from the German Mystics.

INTRODUCTION TO THE DEVOUT LIFE, AN.

DEATH AND IMMORTALITY.

SPIRITUAL GUIDE, THE. *Third Edition.*

DEVOTIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE WEEK AND THE GREAT FESTIVALS.

PRECES PRIVATAE.

HORAE MYSTICAE. A Day Book from the Writings of Mystics of Many Nations.

Little Books on Art

With many Illustrations. Demy 16mo. 5s. net each volume

Each volume consists of about 200 pages, and contains from 30 to 40 Illustrations, including a Frontispiece in Photogravure

ALBRECHT DÜRER. L. J Allen.

ARTS OF JAPAN, THE. E. Dillon. *Third Edition.*

BOOKPLATES. E. Almack.

BOTTICELLI. Mary L. Bonnor.

BURNE-JONES. F. de Lisle. *Third Edition.*

CELLINI. R. H. H. Cust.

CHRISTIAN SYMBOLISM. Mrs. H. Jenner.

CHRIST IN ART. Mrs. H. Jenner.

CLAUDE. E. Dillon.

CONSTABLE. H. W. Tompkins. *Second Edition.*

COROT. A. Pollard and E. Birnstingl.

EARLY ENGLISH WATER-COLOUR. C. E. Hughes.

ENAMELS. Mrs. N. Dawson. *Second Edition.*

FREDERIC LEIGHTON. A. Corkran.

GEORGE ROMNEY. G. Paston.

GREEK ART. H. B. Walters. *Fifth Edition.*

GREUZE AND BOUCHER. E. F. Pollard.

HOLBEIN. Mrs. G. Fortescue.

JEWELLERY. C. Davenport. *Second Edition.*

JOHN HOPPNER. H. P. K. Skipton.

SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS. J. Sime. *Second Edition.*

MILLET. N. Peacock. *Second Edition.*

MINIATURES. C. Davenport, V.D., F.S.A. *Second Edition.*

OUR LADY IN ART. Mrs. H. Jenner.

RAPHAEL. A. R. Dryhurst. *Second Edition.*

RODIN. Muriel Ciolkowska.

TURNER. F. Tyrrell-Gill.

VANDYCK. M. G. Smallwood.

VELAZQUEZ. W. Wilberforce and A. R. Gilbert.

WATTS. R. E. D. Sketchley. *Second Edition.*

The Little Guides

With many Illustrations by E. H. NEW and other artists, and from photographs

Small Pott 8vo. 4s. net each volume

The main features of these Guides are (1) a handy and charming form; (2) illustrations from photographs and by well-known artists; (3) good plans and maps; (4) an adequate but compact presentation of everything that is interesting in the natural features, history, archæology, and architecture of the town or district treated.

CAMBRIDGE AND ITS COLLEGES. A. H. Thompson. *Fourth Edition, Revised.*

CHANNEL ISLANDS, THE. E. E. Bicknell.

ENGLISH LAKES, THE. F. G. Brabant.

ISLE OF WIGHT, THE. G. Clinch.

LONDON. G. Clinch.

MALVERN COUNTRY, THE. Sir B. C. A. Windle. *Second Edition.*

NORTH WALES. A. T. Story.

OXFORD AND ITS COLLEGES. J. Wells. *Tenth Edition.*

ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL. G. Clinch.

SHAKESPEARE'S COUNTRY. Sir B. C. A. Windle. *Fifth Edition.*

SOUTH WALES. G. W. and J. H. Wade.

TEMPLE, THE. H. H. L. Bellot.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY. G. E. Troutbeck. *Second Edition.*

The Little Guides—*continued*

BEDFORDSHIRE AND HUNTINGDONSHIRE. H. W. Macklin.

BERKSHIRE. F. G. Brabant.

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE. E. S. Roscoe. *Second Edition, Revised.*

CAMBRIDGESHIRE. J. C. Cox.

CHESHIRE. W. M. Gallichan.

CORNWALL. A. L. Salmon. *Second Edition.*

DERBYSHIRE. J. C. Cox. *Second Edition.*

DEVON. S. Baring-Gould. *Fourth Edition.*

DORSET. F. R. Heath. *Fourth Edition.*

DURHAM. J. E. Hodgkin.

ESSEX. J. C. Cox. *Second Edition.*

GLOUCESTERSHIRE. J. C. Cox. *Second Edition.*

HAMPSHIRE. J. C. Cox. *Third Edition.*

HEREFORDSHIRE. G. W. and J. H. Wade.

HERTFORDSHIRE. H. W. Tompkins.

KENT. J. C. Cox. *Second Edition, Re-written.*

KERRY. C. P. Crane. *Second Edition.*

LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND. A. Harvey and V. B. Crowther-Beynon.

LINCOLNSHIRE. J. C. Cox.

MIDDLESEX. J. B. Firth.

MONMOUTHSHIRE. G. W. and J. H. Wade.

NORFOLK. W. A. Dutt. *Fourth Edition, Revised.*

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE. W. Dry. *Second Edition, Revised.*

NORTHUMBERLAND. J. E. Morris. 5*s. net.*

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE. L. Guilford.

OXFORDSHIRE. F. G. Brabant. *Second Edition.*

SHROPSHIRE. J. E. Auden. *Second Edition.*

SOMERSET. G. W. and J. H. Wade. *Fourth Edition.*

STAFFORDSHIRE. C. Masefield. *Second Edition.*

SUFFOLK. W. A. Dutt. *Second Edition.*

SURREY. J. C. Cox. *Third Edition, Re-written.*

SUSSEX. F. G. Brabant. *Fifth Edition.*

WARWICKSHIRE. J. C. Cox.

WILTSHIRE. F. R. Heath. *Third Edition.*

YORKSHIRE, THE EAST RIDING. J. E. Morris.

YORKSHIRE, THE NORTH RIDING. J. E. Morris.

YORKSHIRE, THE WEST RIDING. J. E. Morris. 5*s. net.*

BRITTANY. S. Baring-Gould. *Second Edition.*

NORMANDY. C. Scudamore. *Second Edition.*

ROME. C. G. Ellaby.

SICILY. F. H. Jackson.

The Little Library

With Introduction, Notes, and Photogravure Frontispieces

Small Pott 8vo. Each Volume, cloth, 2s. 6d. net; also some volumes in leather at 3s. 6d. net

Anon. A LITTLE BOOK OF ENGLISH LYRICS. *Second Edition.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

Austen (Jane). PRIDE AND PREJUDICE. *Two Volumes.*

NORTHANGER ABBEY.

Bacon (Francis). THE ESSAYS OF LORD BACON.

Barnett (Annie). A LITTLE BOOK OF ENGLISH PROSE. *Third Edition.*

Beckford (William). THE HISTORY OF THE CALIPH VATHEK.

Blake (William). SELECTIONS FROM THE WORKS OF WILLIAM BLAKE.

Browning (Robert). SELECTIONS FROM THE EARLY POEMS OF ROBERT BROWNING.

Canning (George). SELECTIONS FROM THE ANTI-JACOBIN: With some later Poems by GEORGE CANNING.

Cowley (Abraham). THE ESSAYS OF ABRAHAM COWLEY.

The Little Library—*continued*

Crabbe (George). SELECTIONS FROM THE POEMS OF GEORGE CRABBE.

Crashaw (Richard). THE ENGLISH POEMS OF RICHARD CRASHAW.

Dante Alighieri. PURGATORY.
PARADISE.

Darley (George). SELECTIONS FROM THE POEMS OF GEORGE DARLEY.

Kinglake (A. W.). EOTHEN. *Second Edition.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

Locker (F.). LONDON LYRICS.

Marvell (Andrew). THE POEMS OF ANDREW MARVELL.

Milton (John). THE MINOR POEMS OF JOHN MILTON.

Moir (D. M.). MANSIE WAUCH.

Nichols (Bowyer). A LITTLE BOOK OF ENGLISH SONNETS.

Smith (Horace and James). REJECTED ADDRESSES.

Sterne (Laurence). A SENTIMENTAL JOURNEY.

Tennyson (Alfred, Lord). THE EARLY POEMS OF ALFRED, LORD TENNYSON.
IN MEMORIAM.
THE PRINCESS.
MAUD.

Vaughan (Henry). THE POEMS OF HENRY VAUGHAN.

Waterhouse (Elizabeth). A LITTLE BOOK OF LIFE AND DEATH. *Nineteenth Edition.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

Wordsworth (W.). SELECTIONS FROM THE POEMS OF WILLIAM WORDSWORTH. 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

Wordsworth (W.) and Coleridge (S. T.). LYRICAL BALLADS. *Third Edition.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

The Little Quarto Shakespeare

Edited by W. J. CRAIG. With Introductions and Notes

Pott 16*mo.* 40 *Volumes. Leather, price* 1*s.* 9*d. net each volume*

Miniature Library

Demy 32*mo. Leather,* 3*s.* 6*d. net each volume*

EUPHRANOR: A Dialogue on Youth. Edward FitzGerald.

POLONIUS; or, Wise Saws and Modern Instances. Edward FitzGerald.

THE RUBAIYAT OF OMAR KHAYYÁM. Edward FitzGerald. *Fifth Edition. Cloth,* 1*s. net.*

The New Library of Medicine

Edited by C. W. SALEEBY. *Demy* 8*vo*

AIR AND HEALTH. Ronald C. Macfie. *Second Edition.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

CARE OF THE BODY, THE. F. Cavanagh. *Second Edition.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

CHILDREN OF THE NATION, THE. The Right Hon. Sir John Gorst. *Second Edition.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

DISEASES OF OCCUPATION. Sir Thos. Oliver. *Third Edition.* 15*s. net.*

DRUGS AND THE DRUG HABIT. H. Sainsbury. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

FUNCTIONAL NERVE DISEASES. A. T. Schofield. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

HYGIENE OF MIND, THE. Sir T. S. Clouston. *Sixth Edition.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

INFANT MORTALITY. Sir George Newman. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

PREVENTION OF TUBERCULOSIS (CONSUMPTION), THE. Arthur Newsholme. *Second Edition.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

The New Library of Music

Edited by ERNEST NEWMAN. *Illustrated. Demy 8vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net*

BRAHMS. J. A. Fuller-Maitland. *Second Edition.*

HANDEL. R. A. Streatfeild. *Second Edition.*

HUGO WOLF. Ernest Newman.

Oxford Biographies

Illustrated. Fcap. 8vo. Each volume, cloth, 4*s. net; also some in leather,* 5*s. net*

DANTE ALIGHIERI. Paget Toynbee. *Fifth Edition.*

GIROLAMO SAVONAROLA. E. L. S. Horsburgh. *Sixth Edition.*

JOHN HOWARD. E. C. S. Gibson.

SIR WALTER RALEIGH. I. A. Taylor.

ERASMUS. E. F. H. Capey.

CHATHAM. A. S. McDowall.

CANNING. W. Alison Phillips.

Nine Plays

Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d. net*

ACROSS THE BORDER. Beulah Marie Dix.

HONEYMOON, THE. A Comedy in Three Acts. Arnold Bennett. *Third Edition.*

GREAT ADVENTURE, THE. A Play of Fancy in Four Acts. Arnold Bennett. *Fourth Edition.*

MILESTONES. Arnold Bennett and Edward Knoblock. *Eighth Edition.*

IDEAL HUSBAND, AN. Oscar Wilde. *Acting Edition.*

KISMET. Edward Knoblock. *Third Edition.*

TYPHOON. A Play in Four Acts. Melchior Lengyel. English Version by Laurence Irving. *Second Edition.*

WARE CASE, THE. George Pleydell.

GENERAL POST. J. E. Harold Terry. *Second Edition.*

Sport Series

Illustrated. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s. net*

FLYING, ALL ABOUT.

GOLF DO'S AND DONT'S. 'Stancliffe.' *Sixth Edition.*

GOLFING SWING, THE. Burnham Hare. *Fourth Edition.*

HOW TO SWIM. H. R. Austin.

WRESTLING. P. Longhurst.

The States of Italy

Edited by E. ARMSTRONG and R. LANGTON DOUGLAS

Illustrated. Demy 8vo

MILAN UNDER THE SFORZA, A HISTORY OF. Cecilia M. Ady. 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

VERONA, A HISTORY OF. A. M. Allen. 15*s. net.*

PERUGIA, A HISTORY OF. W. Heywood. 15*s. net.*

The Westminster Commentaries

General Editor, WALTER LOCK

Demy 8vo

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, THE. R. B. Rackham. *Seventh Edition.* 16*s. net.*

AMOS. E. A. Edghill. 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

CORINTHIANS, I. H. L. Goudge. *Fourth Edition.* 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

EXODUS. A. H. M'Neile. *Second Edition.* 15*s. net.*

EZEKIEL. H. A. Redpath. 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

GENESIS. S. R. Driver. *Tenth Edition.* 16*s. net.*

HEBREWS. E. C. Wickham. 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

ISAIAH. G. W. Wade. 16*s. net.*

JOB. E. C. S. Gibson. *Second Edition.* 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

PASTORAL EPISTLES, THE. E. F. Brown. 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

PHILIPPIANS, THE. Maurice Jones. 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

ST. JAMES. R. J. Knowling. *Second Edition.* 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

ST. MATTHEW. P. A. Micklem. 15*s. net.*

The 'Young' Series

Illustrated. Crown 8vo

YOUNG BOTANIST, THE. W. P. Westell and C. S. Cooper. 6*s. net.*

YOUNG CARPENTER, THE. Cyril Hall. 6*s. net.*

YOUNG ELECTRICIAN, THE. Hammond Hall. *Second Edition.* 6*s. net.*

YOUNG ENGINEER, THE. Hammond Hall. *Third Edition.* 6*s. net.*

YOUNG NATURALIST, THE. W. P. Westell. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

YOUNG ORNITHOLOGIST, THE. W. P. Westell. 6*s. net.*

Methuen's Cheap Library

Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.* 9*d. net*

ALL THINGS CONSIDERED. G. K. Chesterton.

BEST OF LAMB, THE. Edited by E. V. Lucas.

BLUE BIRD, THE. Maurice Maeterlinck.

CHARLES DICKENS. G. K. Chesterton.

CHARMIDES, AND OTHER POEMS. Oscar Wilde.

CHITRÀL: The Story of a Minor Siege. Sir G. S. Robertson.

DE PROFUNDIS. Oscar Wilde.

FAMOUS WITS, A BOOK OF. W. Jerrold.

FROM MIDSHIPMAN TO FIELD-MARSHAL. Sir Evelyn Wood, F.M., V.C.

HARVEST HOME. E. V. Lucas.

HILLS AND THE SEA. Hilaire Belloc.

HOME LIFE IN FRANCE. M. Betham-Edwards.

IDEAL HUSBAND, AN. Oscar Wilde.

IMPORTANCE OF BEING EARNEST, THE Oscar Wilde.

INTENTIONS. Oscar Wilde.

JANE AUSTEN AND HER TIMES. G. E. MITTON.

JOHN BOYES, KING OF THE WA-KIKUYU. John Boyes.

LADY WINDERMERE'S FAN. Oscar Wilde.

LETTERS FROM A SELF-MADE MERCHANT TO HIS SON. George Horace Lorimer.

LIFE OF JOHN RUSKIN, THE. W. G. Collingwood.

LIFE OF ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON, THE. Graham Balfour.

LITTLE OF EVERYTHING, A. E. V. Lucas.

LORD ARTHUR SAVILE'S CRIME. Oscar Wilde.

LORE OF THE HONEY-BEE, THE. Tickner Edwardes.

MAN AND THE UNIVERSE. Sir Oliver Lodge.

MARY MAGDALENE. Maurice Maeterlinck.

MIRROR OF THE SEA, THE. J. Conrad.

MY CHILDHOOD AND BOYHOOD. Leo Tolstoy.

OLD COUNTRY LIFE. S. Baring-Gould.

ON EVERYTHING. Hilaire Belloc.

ON NOTHING. Hilaire Belloc.

OSCAR WILDE: A Critical Study. Arthur Ransome.

PICKED COMPANY, A. Hilaire Belloc.

REASON AND BELIEF. Sir Oliver Lodge.

R. L. S. Francis Watt.

SCIENCE FROM AN EASY CHAIR. Sir Ray Lankester.

SELECTED POEMS. Oscar Wilde.

SELECTED PROSE. Oscar Wilde.

SHEPHERD'S LIFE, A. W. H. Hudson.

SHILLING FOR MY THOUGHTS, A. G. K. Chesterton.

SOCIAL EVILS AND THEIR REMEDY. Leo Tolstoy.

SOME LETTERS OF R. L. STEVENSON. Selected by Lloyd Osbourne.

SUBSTANCE OF FAITH, THE. Sir Oliver Lodge.

SURVIVAL OF MAN, THE. Sir Oliver Lodge.

TENNYSON. A. C. Benson.

THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY. P. Chalmers-Mitchell.

TOWER OF LONDON, THE. R. Davey.

TWO ADMIRALS. Admiral John Moresby.

UNDER FIVE REIGNS. Lady Dorothy Nevill.

VAILIMA LETTERS. Robert Louis Stevenson.

VARIETY LANE. E. V. Lucas.

VICAR OF MORWENSTOW, THE. S. Baring-Gould.

WOMAN OF NO IMPORTANCE, A. Oscar Wilde.

A Selection only.

Books for Travellers

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net each

Each volume contains a number of Illustrations in Colour

AVON AND SHAKESPEARE'S COUNTRY, THE. A. G. Bradley. *Second Edition.*

BLACK FOREST, A BOOK OF THE. C. E. Hughes.

CITIES OF LOMBARDY, THE. Edward Hutton.

CITIES OF ROMAGNA AND THE MARCHES, THE. Edward Hutton.

CITIES OF SPAIN, THE. Edward Hutton. *Fifth Edition.*

CITIES OF UMBRIA, THE. Edward Hutton. *Fifth Edition.*

EGYPT, BY THE WATERS OF. N. Lorimer. *Third Edition.*

FLORENCE AND NORTHERN TUSCANY, WITH GENOA. Edward Hutton. *Third Edition.*

LAND OF PARDONS, THE (Brittany). Anatole Le Braz. *Fourth Edition.*

LONDON REVISITED. E. V. Lucas. *Third Edition.* 8s. 6d. *net.*

NAPLES. Arthur H. Norway. *Fourth Edition.* 8s. 6d. *net.*

NAPLES AND SOUTHERN ITALY. Edward Hutton.

NAPLES RIVIERA, THE. H. M. Vaughan *Second Edition.*

NEW FOREST, THE. Horace G. Hutchinson. *Fourth Edition*

NORWAY AND ITS FJORDS. M. A. Wyllie.

RHINE, A BOOK OF THE. S. Baring-Gould.

ROME. Edward Hutton. *Third Edition.*

ROUND ABOUT WILTSHIRE. A. G. Bradley. *Third Edition.*

SCOTLAND OF TO-DAY. T. F. Henderson and Francis Watt. *Third Edition.*

SIENA AND SOUTHERN TUSCANY. Edward Hutton. *Second Edition.*

SKIRTS OF THE GREAT CITY, THE. Mrs. A. G. Bell. *Second Edition.*

VENICE AND VENETIA. Edward Hutton.

WANDERER IN FLORENCE, A. E. V. Lucas. *Sixth Edition.* 8s. 6d. *net.*

WANDERER IN PARIS, A. E. V. Lucas. *Thirteenth Edition.* 8s. 6d. *net.*

WANDERER IN HOLLAND, A. E. V. Lucas. *Sixteenth Edition.* 8s. 6d. *net*

WANDERER IN LONDON, A. E. V. Lucas. *Eighteenth Edition.* 8s. 6d. *net.*

WANDERER IN VENICE, A. E. V. Lucas. *Second Edition.* 8s. 6d. *net.*

Some Books on Art

ART, ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL. M. H. Bulley. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d. *net.*

BRITISH SCHOOL, THE. An Anecdotal Guide to the British Painters and Paintings in the National Gallery. E. V. Lucas. Illustrated. *Fcap. 8vo.* 6s. *net.*

DECORATIVE IRON WORK. From the XIth to the XVIIIth Century. Charles ffoulkes. *Royal 4to.* £2 2s. *net.*

FRANCESCO GUARDI, 1712–1793. G. A. Simonson. Illustrated. *Imperial 4to.* £2 2s. *net.*

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE BOOK OF JOB. William Blake. *Quarto.* £1 1s. *net.*

ITALIAN SCULPTORS. W. G. Waters. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d. *net.*

OLD PASTE. A. Beresford Ryley. Illustrated. *Royal 4to.* £2 2s. *net.*

ONE HUNDRED MASTERPIECES OF SCULPTURE. With an Introduction by G. F. Hill. Illustrated. *Demy 8vo.* 12s. 6d. *net.*

ROYAL ACADEMY LECTURES ON PAINTING. George Clausen. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d. *net.*

SAINTS IN ART, THE. Margaret E. Tabor. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo.* 5s. *net.*

SCHOOLS OF PAINTING. Mary Innes. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo.* 7s. 6d. *net.*

CELTIC ART IN PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN TIMES. J. R. Allen. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Demy 8vo.* 10s. 6d. *net.*

Some Books on Italy

FLORENCE AND HER TREASURES. H. M. Vaughan. Illustrated. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

FLORENCE AND THE CITIES OF NORTHERN TUSCANY, WITH GENOA. Edward Hutton. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

LOMBARDY, THE CITIES OF. Edward Hutton. Illustrated. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

MILAN UNDER THE SFORZA, A HISTORY OF. Cecilia M. Ady. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

NAPLES: Past and Present. A. H. Norway. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

NAPLES RIVIERA, THE. H. M. Vaughan. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

NAPLES AND SOUTHERN ITALY. E. Hutton. Illustrated. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

PERUGIA, A HISTORY OF. William Heywood. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

ROME. Edward Hutton. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

ROMAGNA AND THE MARCHES, THE CITIES OF. Edward Hutton. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

ROME. C. G. Ellaby. Illustrated. *Small Pott* 8*vo.* 4*s. net.*

SICILY. F. H. Jackson. Illustrated. *Small Pott* 8*vo.* 4*s. net.*

SICILY: The New Winter Resort. Douglas Sladen. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

SIENA AND SOUTHERN TUSCANY. Edward Hutton. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

UMBRIA, THE CITIES OF. Edward Hutton. Illustrated. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

VENICE AND VENETIA. Edward Hutton Illustrated. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

VENICE ON FOOT. H. A. Douglas. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net*

VENICE AND HER TREASURES. H. A. Douglas. Illustrated. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

VERONA, A HISTORY OF. A. M. Allen Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

DANTE ALIGHIERI: His Life and Works. Paget Toynbee. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

LAKES OF NORTHERN ITALY, THE. Richard Bagot. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

SAVONAROLA, GIROLAMO. E. L. S. Horsburgh. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

SKIES ITALIAN: A Little Breviary for Travellers in Italy. Ruth S. Phelps. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

PART III.—A SELECTION OF WORKS OF FICTION

Albanesi (E. Maria). I KNOW A MAIDEN. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE GLAD HEART. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Aumonier (Stacy). OLGA BARDEL. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Bagot (Richard). THE HOUSE OF SERRAVALLE. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Bailey (H. C.). THE SEA CAPTAIN. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE HIGHWAYMAN. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE GAMESTERS. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE YOUNG LOVERS. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Baring-Gould (S.). THE BROOM-SQUIRE. Illustrated. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Barr (Robert). IN THE MIDST OF ALARMS. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE COUNTESS TEKLA. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE MUTABLE MANY. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Begbie (Harold). THE CURIOUS AND DIVERTING ADVENTURES OF SIR JOHN SPARROW, BART.; OR, THE PROGRESS OF AN OPEN MIND. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Belloc (H.). EMMANUEL BURDEN, MERCHANT. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Bennett (Arnold). CLAYHANGER. *Twelfth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

HILDA LESSWAYS. *Eighth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THESE TWAIN. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE CARD. *Thirteenth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s. net.*

THE REGENT: A FIVE TOWNS STORY OF ADVENTURE IN LONDON. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE PRICE OF LOVE. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

BURIED ALIVE. *Ninth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

A MAN FROM THE NORTH. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE MATADOR OF THE FIVE TOWNS. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

WHOM GOD HATH JOINED. *A New Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

A GREAT MAN: A FROLIC. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Benson (E. F.). DODO: A DETAIL OF THE DAY. *Seventeenth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Birmingham (George A.). SPANISH GOLD. *Seventeenth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE SEARCH PARTY. *Tenth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s. net.*

LALAGE'S LOVERS. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE ADVENTURES OF DR. WHITTY. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

GOSSAMER. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE ISLAND MYSTERY. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s. net.*

Bowen (Marjorie). I WILL MAINTAIN. *Ninth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

DEFENDER OF THE FAITH. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

WILLIAM, BY THE GRACE OF GOD. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

GOD AND THE KING. *Sixth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

PRINCE AND HERETIC. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

A KNIGHT OF SPAIN. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE QUEST OF GLORY. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE GOVERNOR OF ENGLAND. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE CARNIVAL OF FLORENCE. *Fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

MR. WASHINGTON. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

"BECAUSE OF THESE THINGS. . . ." *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE THIRD ESTATE. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

KINGS AT ARMS. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Castle (Agnes and Egerton). THE GOLDEN BARRIER. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Conrad (Joseph). A SET OF SIX. *Fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

VICTORY: AN ISLAND TALE. *Fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Conyers (Dorothea). SANDY MARRIED. *Fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

OLD ANDY. *Fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE BLIGHTING OF BARTRAM. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. net.*

Corelli (Marie). A ROMANCE OF TWO WORLDS. *Thirty-fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

VENDETTA; OR, THE STORY OF ONE FORGOTTEN. *Thirty-fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THELMA: A NORWEGIAN PRINCESS. *Forty-ninth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

ARDATH: THE STORY OF A DEAD SELF. *Twenty-fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE SOUL OF LILITH. *Twentieth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

WORMWOOD: A DRAMA OF PARIS. *Twenty-second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

BARABBAS: A DREAM OF THE WORLD'S TRAGEDY. *Fiftieth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE SORROWS OF SATAN. *Sixty-third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE MASTER-CHRISTIAN. *Eighteenth Edition. 184th Thousand. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

TEMPORAL POWER: A STUDY IN SUPREMACY. *Second Edition. 150th Thousand. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

GOD'S GOOD MAN: A SIMPLE LOVE STORY. *Twentieth Edition. 159th Thousand. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

HOLY ORDERS: THE TRAGEDY OF A QUIET LIFE. *Third Edition. 121st Thousand. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE MIGHTY ATOM. *Thirty-sixth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

BOY: A SKETCH. *Twentieth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

CAMEOS. *Fifteenth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE LIFE EVERLASTING. *Eighth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Crockett (S. R.). LOCHINVAR. Illustrated. *Fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE STANDARD BEARER. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Doyle (Sir A. Conan). ROUND THE RED LAMP. *Twelfth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Dudeney (Mrs. H.). THIS WAY OUT. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Fry (B. and C. B.). A MOTHER'S SON. *Fifth Edition Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Harraden (Beatrice). THE GUIDING THREAD. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Hichens (Robert). THE PROPHET OF BERKELEY SQUARE. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

TONGUES OF CONSCIENCE. *Fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

FELIX: THREE YEARS IN A LIFE. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE WOMAN WITH THE FAN. *Eighth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

BYEWAYS. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE GARDEN OF ALLAH. *Twenty-sixth Edition.* Illustrated. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

THE CALL OF THE BLOOD. *Ninth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

BARBARY SHEEP. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE DWELLER ON THE THRESHOLD. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE WAY OF AMBITION. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

IN THE WILDERNESS. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Hope (Anthony). A CHANGE OF AIR. *Sixth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

A MAN OF MARK. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE CHRONICLES OF COUNT ANTONIO. *Sixth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

PHROSO. Illustrated. *Ninth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

SIMON DALE. Illustrated. *Ninth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE KING'S MIRROR. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

QUISANTÉ. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE DOLLY DIALOGUES. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

TALES OF TWO PEOPLE. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

A SERVANT OF THE PUBLIC. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE GREAT MISS DRIVER. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

MRS. MAXON PROTESTS. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

A YOUNG MAN'S YEAR. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Hyne (C. J. Cutcliffe). MR. HORROCKS, PURSER. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

FIREMEN HOT. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

CAPTAIN KETTLE ON THE WARPATH. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

RED HERRINGS. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Jacobs (W. W.). MANY CARGOES. *Thirty-third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*
Also Cr. 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

SEA URCHINS. *Nineteenth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s.* net.
Also Cr. 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

A MASTER OF CRAFT. Illustrated. *Eleventh Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

LIGHT FREIGHTS. Illustrated. *Fifteenth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

THE SKIPPER'S WOOING. *Twelfth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

AT SUNWICH PORT. Illustrated. *Eleventh Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

DIALSTONE LANE. Illustrated. *Eighth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo* 5*s. net.*

ODD CRAFT. Illustrated. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

THE LADY OF THE BARGE. Illustrated. *Tenth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

SALTHAVEN. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

SAILORS' KNOTS. Illustrated. *Sixth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

SHORT CRUISES. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

King (Basil). THE LIFTED VEIL. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Lethbridge (Sybil C.). ONE WOMAN'S HERO. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

London (Jack). WHITE FANG. *Ninth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Lowndes (Mrs. Belloc). THE LODGER. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Lucas (E. V.). LISTENER'S LURE: AN OBLIQUE NARRATION. *Twelfth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

OVER BEMERTON'S: AN EASY-GOING CHRONICLE. *Sixteenth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

MR. INGLESIDE. *Thirteenth Edition. Fcap* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

LONDON LAVENDER. *Twelfth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

LANDMARKS. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

THE VERMILION BOX. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Lyall (Edna). DERRICK VAUGHAN, NOVELIST. *44th Thousand. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

McKenna (Stephen). SONIA: BETWEEN TWO WORLDS. *Sixteenth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 8s. *net.*

NINETY-SIX HOURS' LEAVE. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 7s. *net.*

THE SIXTH SENSE. *Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Macnaughtan (S.). PETER AND JANE. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Malet (Lucas). THE HISTORY OF SIR RICHARD CALMADY: A ROMANCE. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE WAGES OF SIN. *Sixteenth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE CARISSIMA. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE GATELESS BARRIER. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Mason (A. E. W.). CLEMENTINA. Illustrated. *Ninth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Maxwell (W. B.). VIVIEN. *Thirteenth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE GUARDED FLAME. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

ODD LENGTHS. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

HILL RISE. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE REST CURE. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Milne (A. A.). THE DAY'S PLAY. *Sixth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE HOLIDAY ROUND. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

ONCE A WEEK. *Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Morrison (Arthur). TALES OF MEAN STREETS. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

A CHILD OF THE JAGO. *Sixth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE HOLE IN THE WALL. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

DIVERS VANITIES. *Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Oppenheim (E. Phillips). MASTER OF MEN. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE MISSING DELORA. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE DOUBLE LIFE OF MR. ALFRED BURTON. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

A PEOPLE'S MAN. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

MR. GREX OF MONTE CARLO. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE VANISHED MESSENGER. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE HILLMAN. *Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Oxenham (John). A WEAVER OF WEBS. Illustrated. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

PROFIT AND LOSS. *Sixth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE SONG OF HYACINTH, AND OTHER STORIES. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

MY LADY OF SHADOWS. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

LAURISTONS. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE COIL OF CARNE. *Sixth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE QUEST OF THE GOLDEN ROSE. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

MARY ALL-ALONE. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

BROKEN SHACKLES. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

"1914." *Third Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Parker (Gilbert). PIERRE AND HIS PEOPLE. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

MRS. FALCHION. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE TRANSLATION OF A SAVAGE. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE TRAIL OF THE SWORD. Illustrated. *Tenth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

WHEN VALMOND CAME TO PONTIAC: THE STORY OF A LOST NAPOLEON. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

AN ADVENTURER OF THE NORTH: THE LAST ADVENTURES OF 'PRETTY PIERRE.' *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE SEATS OF THE MIGHTY. Illustrated. *Twentieth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE BATTLE OF THE STRONG: A ROMANCE OF TWO KINGDOMS. Illustrated. *Seventh Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE POMP OF THE LAVILETTES. *Third Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

NORTHERN LIGHTS. *Fourth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Perrin (Alice). THE CHARM. *Fifth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Phillpotts (Eden). CHILDREN OF THE MIST. *Sixth Edition. Cr.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

THE HUMAN BOY. With a Frontispiece. *Seventh Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

SONS OF THE MORNING. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE RIVER. *Fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE AMERICAN PRISONER. *Fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

DEMETER'S DAUGHTER. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE HUMAN BOY AND THE WAR. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Pickthall (Marmaduke). SAID, THE FISHERMAN. *Tenth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Ridge (W. Pett). A SON OF THE STATE. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE REMINGTON SENTENCE. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

MADAME PRINCE. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

TOP SPEED. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 7s. net.*

Rohmer (Sax). THE DEVIL DOCTOR. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE SI-FAN MYSTERIES. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Swinnerton (F.). SHOPS AND HOUSES. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Wells (H. G.). BEALBY. *Fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Weyman (Stanley). UNDER THE RED ROBE. Illustrated. *Thirtieth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

Williamson (C. N. and A. M.). THE LIGHTNING CONDUCTOR: THE STRANGE ADVENTURES OF A MOTOR CAR. Illustrated. *Twenty-second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE PRINCESS PASSES: A ROMANCE OF A MOTOR. Illustrated. *Ninth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

LADY BETTY ACROSS THE WATER. *Nineteenth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE CAR OF DESTINY. Illustrated. *Seventh Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

SCARLET RUNNER. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

LORD LOVELAND DISCOVERS AMERICA. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE GOLDEN SILENCE. Illustrated. *Eighth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE GUESTS OF HERCULES. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE HEATHER MOON. Illustrated. *Fifth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

IT HAPPENED IN EGYPT. Illustrated. *Seventh Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

A SOLDIER OF THE LEGION. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE SHOP GIRL. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE LIGHTNING CONDUCTRESS. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

SECRET HISTORY. *Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*

THE LOVE PIRATE. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.*
Also Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

THE COWBOY COUNTESS. *Cr. 8vo 3s. 6d. net.*

LORD JOHN IN NEW YORK. *Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

Books for Boys and Girls

Illustrated. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

GETTING WELL OF DOROTHY, THE. Mrs. W. K. Clifford.

GIRL OF THE PEOPLE, A. L. T. Meade.

HONOURABLE MISS, THE. L. T. Meade.

MASTER ROCKAFELLAR'S VOYAGE. W. Clark Russell.

ONLY A GUARD-ROOM DOG. Edith E. Cuthell.

RED GRANGE, THE. Mrs. Molesworth.

THERE WAS ONCE A PRINCE. Mrs. M. E. Mann.

Methuen's Cheap Novels

Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 9*d. net*

ADVENTURES OF DR. WHITTY, THE. George A. Birmingham.

ANGLO-INDIANS, THE. Alice Perrin.

ANNA OF THE FIVE TOWNS. Arnold Bennett.

ANTHONY CUTHBERT. Richard Bagot.

BABES IN THE WOOD. B. M. Croker.

BAD TIMES, THE. George A. Birmingham.

BARBARY SHEEP. Robert Hichens.

BECAUSE OF THESE THINGS. . . . Marjorie Bowen.

BELOVED ENEMY, THE. E. Maria Albanesi.

BOTOR CHAPERON, THE. C. N. and A. M. Williamson.

BOY. Marie Corelli.

BROKEN SHACKLES. John Oxenham.

BROOM SQUIRE, THE. S. Baring-Gould.

BURIED ALIVE. Arnold Bennett.

BYEWAYS. Robert Hichens.

CALL OF THE BLOOD, THE. Robert Hichens.

CAMEOS. Marie Corelli.

CARD, THE. Arnold Bennett.

CHANCE. Joseph Conrad.

CHANGE IN THE CABINET, A Hilaire Belloc.

CHINK IN THE ARMOUR, THE. Mrs. Belloc Lowndes.

CHRONICLES OF A GERMAN TOWN. The Author of "Mercia in Germany."

COIL OF CARNE, THE. John Oxenham.

COUNSEL OF PERFECTION, A. Lucas Malet.

CROOKED WAY, THE. William Le Queux.

DAN RUSSEL THE FOX. E. Œ. Somerville and Martin Ross.

DEAD MEN TELL NO TALES. E. W. Hornung.

DEMON, THE. C. N. and A. M. Williamson.

DOUBLE LIFE OF MR. ALFRED BURTON, THE. E. Phillips Oppenheim.

DUKE'S MOTTO, THE. J. H. McCarthy.

EMMANUEL BURDEN. Hilaire Belloc.

END OF HER HONEYMOON, THE. Mrs. Belloc Lowndes.

FAMILY, THE. Elinor Mordaunt.

FIRE IN STUBBLE. Baroness Orczy.

FIREMEN HOT. C. J. Cutcliffe Hyne.

FLOWER OF THE DUSK. Myrtle Reed.

GATE OF THE DESERT, THE. John Oxenham.

GATES OF WRATH, THE. Arnold Bennett.

GENTLEMAN ADVENTURER, THE. H. C. Bailey.

GOLDEN CENTIPEDE, THE. Louise Gerard.

GOLDEN SILENCE, THE. C. N. and A. M. Williamson.

GOSSAMER. George A. Birmingham.

GOVERNOR OF ENGLAND, THE. Marjorie Bowen.

GREAT MAN, A. Arnold Bennett.

GUARDED FLAME, THE. W. B. Maxwell.

HALO, THE. Baroness von Hutten.

HAPPY HUNTING GROUND, THE. Alice Perrin.

HAPPY VALLEY, THE. B. M. Croker.

HEART OF HIS HEART. E. Maria Albanesi.

HEART OF THE ANCIENT WOOD, THE. Charles G. D. Roberts.

HEATHER MOON, THE. C. N. and A. M. Williamson.

HERITAGE OF PERIL, A. A. W. Marchmont.

HIGHWAYMAN, The. H. C. Bailey.

HILL RISE. W. B. Maxwell.

HOUSE OF SERRAVALLE, THE. Richard Bagot.

HYENA OF KALLU, THE. Louise Gerard.

JANE. Marie Corelli.

JOHANNA. B. M. Croker.

JOSEPH. Frank Danby.

JOSHUA DAVIDSON, COMMUNIST. E. Lynn Linton.

KINSMAN, THE. Mrs. Alfred Sidgwick.

KNIGHT OF SPAIN, A. Marjorie Bowen.

LADY BETTY ACROSS THE WATER. C. N. and A. M. Williamson.

LALAGE'S LOVERS. George A. Birmingham.

LANTERN BEARERS, THE. Mrs. Alfred Sidgwick.

LAURISTONS. John Oxenham.

LAVENDER AND OLD LACE. Myrtle Reed.

LIGHT FREIGHTS. W. W. Jacobs.

LODGER, THE. Mrs. Belloc Lowndes.

Methuen's Cheap Novels—*continued.*

LONG ROAD, THE. John Oxenham.

LOVE PIRATE, THE. C. N. and A. M. Williamson.

MASTER'S VIOLIN, THE. Myrtle Reed.

MAX CARRADOS. Ernest Bramah.

MAYOR OF TROY, THE. "Q."

MESS DECK, THE. W. F. Shannon.

MIGHTY ATOM, THE. Marie Corelli.

MIRAGE. E. Temple Thurston.

MISSING DELORA, THE. E. Phillips Oppenheim.

MR. GREX OF MONTE CARLO. E. Phillips Oppenheim.

MR. WASHINGTON. Marjorie Bowen.

MRS. MAXON PROTESTS. Anthony Hope.

MY DANISH SWEETHEART. W. Clark Russell.

MY FRIEND THE CHAUFFEUR. C. N. and A. M. Williamson.

MY HUSBAND AND I. Leo Tolstoy.

MY LADY OF SHADOWS. John Oxenham.

MYSTERY OF DR. FU-MANCHU, THE. Sax Rohmer.

MYSTERY OF THE GREEN HEART, THE. Max Pemberton.

NINE DAYS' WONDER, A. B. M. Croker.

NINE TO SIX-THIRTY. W. Pett Ridge.

OCEAN SLEUTH, THE. Maurice Drake.

OLD ROSE AND SILVER. Myrtle Reed.

PATHWAY OF THE PIONEER, THE. Dolf Wyllarde.

PEGGY OF THE BARTONS. B. M. Croker.

PEOPLE'S MAN, A. E. Phillips Oppenheim.

PETER AND JANE. S. Macnaughtan.

QUEST OF GLORY, THE. Marjorie Bowen.

QUEST OF THE GOLDEN ROSE, THE. John Oxenham.

REGENT, THE. Arnold Bennett.

REMINGTON SENTENCE, THE. W. Pett Ridge.

ROUND THE RED LAMP. Sir A. Conan Doyle.

SAÏD, THE FISHERMAN. Marmaduke Pickthall.

SALLY. Dorothea Conyers.

SALVING OF A DERELICT, THE. Maurice Drake.

SANDY MARRIED. Dorothea Conyers.

SEA CAPTAIN, THE. H. C. Bailey.

SEA LADY, THE. H. G. Wells.

SEARCH PARTY, THE. George A. Birmingham.

SECRET AGENT, THE. Joseph Conrad.

SECRET HISTORY. C. N. and A. M. Williamson.

SECRET WOMAN, THE. Eden Phillpotts.

SET IN SILVER. C. N. and A. M. Williamson.

SEVASTOPOL, AND OTHER STORIES. Leo Tolstoy.

SEVERINS, THE. Mrs. Alfred Sidgwick.

SHORT CRUISES. W. W. Jacobs.

SPANISH GOLD. George A. Birmingham.

SPINNER IN THE SUN, A. Myrtle Reed.

STREET CALLED STRAIGHT, THE. Basil King.

TALES OF MEAN STREETS. Arthur Morrison.

TARZAN OF THE APES. Edgar Rice Burroughs.

TERESA OF WATLING STREET. Arnold Bennett.

THE SECRET AGENT. John Conrad.

THERE WAS A CROOKED MAN. Dolf Wyllarde.

TYRANT, THE. Mrs. Henry de la Pasture.

UNDER THE RED ROBE. Stanley J. Weyman.

UNDER WESTERN EYES. Joseph Conrad.

UNOFFICIAL HONEYMOON, THE. Dolf Wyllarde.

VALLEY OF THE SHADOW, THE. William Le Queux.

VIRGINIA PERFECT. Peggy Webling.

WALLET OF KAI LUNG. Ernest Bramah.

WARE CASE, THE. George Pleydell.

WAY HOME, THE. Basil King.

WAY OF THESE WOMEN, THE. E. Phillips Oppenheim.

WEAVER OF DREAMS, A. Myrtle Reed.

WEAVER OF WEBS, A. John Oxenham.

WEDDING DAY, THE. C. N. and A. M. Williamson.

WHITE FANG. Jack London.

WILD OLIVE, THE. Basil King.

WOMAN WITH THE FAN, THE. Robert Hichens.

WO_2. Maurice Drake.

WONDER OF LOVE, THE. F. Maria Albanesi.

YELLOW CLAW, THE. Sax Rohmer.

Methuen's One and Threepenny Novels

Fcap. 8*vo.* 1*s.* 3*d. net*

BARBARA REBELL. Mrs. Belloc Lowndes.

BY STROKE OF SWORD. Andrew Balfour.

DERRICK VAUGHAN, NOVELIST. Edna Lyall.

DODO. E. F. Benson.

DRAMA IN SUNSHINE, A. H. A. Vachell.

HOUSE OF WHISPERS, THE. William Le Queux.

HUMAN BOY, THE. Eden Phillpotts.

I CROWN THEE KING. Max Pemberton.

INCA'S TREASURE, THE. E. Glanville.

KATHERINE THE ARROGANT. Mrs. B. M. Croker.

MISER HOADLEY'S SECRET. A. W. Marchmont.

POMP OF THE LAVILETTES, THE. Sir Gilbert Parker.

PROFIT AND LOSS. John Oxenham.

SIGN OF THE SPIDER, THE. Bertram Mitford.

SON OF THE STATE, A. W. Pett Ridge.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, *Edinburgh*

24/9/18

234.1R
T664
Townsend, Henry
AUTHOR
The doctrine of grace in the
TITLE
234.1TR
T664
65899